Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 2. MAY, 1923.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Religious Thought of Ernst Troeltsch .. 57
W. D. Morrison, LLD.

Liberty and Definition 66
E. J. Martin, B.D.

A Clerical Nimrod 71
The Editor.

Three Ideals of Christianity 83
J. C. Hardwick, M.A.

Saints' Days, Old and New 91
A. F. Robson, M.A.

Book Reviews:—
A Standard New Testament Handbook .. 101
A New Life of Christ 102
Wholesome Words 104
Religion at Seventeen 105
Friend or Foe? 106

Correspondence:—
Psychical Research 108
The Liberal Christian League 108

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

QUALITY **SERVICE**

IF YOU REQUIRE

The finest Wines, Spirits Cigars and Tobacco,
The best quality Provisions, Groceries & Confectionery
Combined with prompt and courteous attention,
Then you will save money, trouble and time
by ordering from

GRIMBLY HUGHES & CO. LTD. **THE CORNMARKET STORES, OXFORD.**

Telephone "Oxford Four."

THE MITRE HOTEL, OXFORD.

THIS well-known Hotel for Families and Gentlemen, which is situate in the centre of the finest street in Europe, close to the Colleges, and within an easy distance of the river, has been enlarged and much improved. While the traditional antiquity of the building has been carefully preserved, visitors will find in it all the refined comforts of a MODERN HOTEL. The MITRE is largely patronized by distinguished English, American, and Continental Visitors, and is recognised as one of the best first-class Hotels in the United Kingdom.

Dining, Drawing, Reading and Smoking Rooms, Lounge, Good Suites of Rooms, and Four Spacious Billiard Rooms.
Electric Light. A Night Porter in attendance.

Tariff on application to C. J. VERT, Manager. Telephone 335. Telegrams: 'Mitre,' Oxford.

HOOKHAM & COMPANY,

Clerical Outfits for Home or Colonial Wear.
Academical Robe Makers.

TAILORS, SHIRTMAKERS, HOSIERS, HATTERS.

3 CORNMARKET, OXFORD.

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2. MAY, 1923. Vol. XIII.

THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF ERNST TROELTSCH

By the Rev. Dr. W. D. Morrison, Rector of Marylebone.

IT was with a deep sense of disappointment that I opened the *Times* a few weeks ago, and found in it a notice of the death of Professor Ernst Troeltsch, of the University of Berlin, at the comparatively early age of fifty-six. Very few of his religious writings have been translated into English, and except in academic circles he is little known among us. He was on the point of coming over to England to deliver lectures at the Universities of Oxford and London, and his friend of many years standing, Baron von Hügel, had very kindly asked me to hear him lecture in his house at Kensington. I was looking forward to meeting him with much interest and pleasure, as I had for many years been much attracted by the writings of Troeltsch. In these days it is not easy to get a hearing for our late enemies across the Rhine, and yet it is of essential importance that we should know what they are thinking. However much we may dislike the policy of the fallen German empire, we cannot afford to neglect the movements of contemporary German thought. The Germans, in spite of their political aberrations, are a highly intellectual people, and the German mind has exercised a deep influence, both for good and evil, on the civilization of Europe. The attitude of the German people during the war has turned

the faces of most of us against anything produced in Germany, whether material or intellectual. And it must be acknowledged that the teachers of the youth in the German Universities in too many cases made themselves the docile mouthpieces of the sinister policy of the imperial government. Baron von Hügel, in a fine tribute to the memory of his friend in the *Literary Supplement* to the *Times*, says of him that he was free from all chauvinism, but he dreaded the conflict which he saw on the horizon. Even in 1905 he observed with deep anxiety the growing hostility to England among the German people. 'May God,' he said, 'prevent a conflict which would bring joy only to carnal and worldly interests.' When the conflict at last came, Troeltsch was for a moment swept by the passions of the war out of his true course. But it is impossible to read his writings without realizing that the main currents of his mind are incompatible with the military ideals and reactionary aims of the late ruling classes of Berlin.

One of the reasons which has made Troeltsch's name so little known among us as compared, for instance, with Pfleiderer and Harnack, is the difficulty of his style. His sentences are overloaded with thought, and from time to time it is not easy to translate his meaning into precise and definite forms. He wants to include so much in every sentence that he includes too much. We have, as Baron von Hügel says, to persevere with him before we can be sure we understand him. But if we persevere we find that he has an impressiveness, a comprehensive grasp of his materials; an insight; a secure mastery of the currents of modern religious and philosophic thought; a grasp of its historical development, which have made him the leading spirit of the Liberal Christian position on the continent. Some people imagine that the movement of liberal religious thought is the product of a little band of ecclesiastical agitators discontented with the traditional conceptions handed down to us in the creeds and confessions of faith. If this were a true interpretation of the facts, this modern movement might with impunity be ignored and the Church might securely move along the old lines and continue to repeat the old formulas; but, as Troeltsch conclusively shows, it is not true. The present unsettlement in the ecclesiastical world is the outcome of a combination of circum-

stances and conditions which have made unsettlement inevitable, and it will continue till a new synthesis arises preserving all the deep religious values of the past in combination with a modern outlook upon the world and life.

The conditions which have produced the existing religious disquietude arise out of the contrast between the mediaeval and modern types of civilization. Mediaeval civilization, as Troeltsch points out, is based upon the infallible authority of the Church : it was essentially a Church civilization.

> ' Church civilization is based on the belief in an immediate Divine revelation and the embodiment of this revelation in the Church as the organ of redemption and moral discipline. There is nothing to be compared with the power of such a faith when it is really a natural growth and stands unquestioned. For when this is the case God as the Divine Will is everywhere, immediately present, exactly recognisable, having as His organ an infallible institution. In these conditions all strength for great achievements, and all assurance regarding the ultimate goal of life, are drawn from this revelation and its organised expression in the Church. The creation of this mighty edifice was the last effort of antiquity under the decisive influence of Christianity, and this edifice forms the centre of what is known as mediaeval civilization.'

It is easy to understand that such a view has many attractions for the clergy and the ecclesiastically-minded laity. At the time when it originated it was perhaps the only means of saving the shattered fabric of ancient civilization from an avalanche of undiluted barbarism. Society usually creates the sanctions it requires, and the imposing edifice of the Catholic Church for many centuries held the world in awe.

But Church civilization, based upon the principle of authority, and deriving its tremendous force from this principle, has had to succumb, as Troeltsch points out, to the modern principle of individual liberty.

> ' This new principle is everywhere engaged in opposing Church civilization, and in substituting for it ideals of civilization independently arrived at, the authority of which depends on their inherent and immediate capacity to produce conviction. This independence, whatever its basis as opposed to Church authority, to purely external divinely given standards, dominates everything. Even where new authorities are in principle established or in practice followed, the respect accorded to them arises from purely independent and rational conviction. Even where the older religious convictions hold their ground, their truth and their binding force, at least among Protestants, are principally based on inner personal conviction and not on submission to authority as such.'

This new principle of individual liberty, whether a true principle or a false, is now an essential part of the mental furniture of the modern world—and by the modern world is meant the civilization of Europe and America—and the only power likely to dethrone it is not the re-establishment of an autocracy resting on divine sanctions, but the conquest of the State by some type of bureaucratic socialism. Such a system would be a reversion to the mediaeval Church type of civilization, but it would derive its sanctions not from divine authority, but from the material authority of the masses. Liberalism, whether in Church or State, is in its origin, as in its nature, an aristocratic principle having its roots in respect for human personality. Omens are not wanting that it may be swallowed up by the incoming tide of democracy with its demands not for a mediaeval paradise, but for a heaven upon earth. Even in such an event the cleavage between the old Church civilization and a socialistic civilization would remain as acute as the present cleavage between the ideals of liberty and authority. The only difference is that we should witness two sets of believers in absolute authority competing for power, and whichever won, liberty would perish.

I must not be supposed to commit Troeltsch to the immediately preceding reflections: in fact Germans are more concerned with liberty to think than with liberty to live. In the religious sphere it is Troeltsch's contention that the belief in individual liberty is an essentially Christian idea.

> 'It is based, he says, on the idea of the destination of man to acquire perfected personality through ascent to God, as the source both of all personal life and also of the world—an ascent which therefore consists in a being laid hold of and moulded by the Divine Spirit. It is the metaphysic herein implied of absolute Personality, which directly or indirectly permeates our whole world and gives to the thought of freedom, of personality, of the autonomous self, a metaphysical background which has its influence even when it is contested or denied. This spiritual temper was founded by Christianity and Israelitish Prophetism. Protestantism has consciously and definitely formulated it into a principle, loosed it from its connection with a hierarchic world-dominating institution, and made it capable of freely combining with all the interests and factors of life.'

Troeltsch mentions in detail many other contrasts between the modern and the mediaeval attitude of mind, some of which we can do little more than merely mention. There is, for

instance, the modern conception of Nature, which has abolished the old mediaeval cosmology and removed the earth from the centre of the universe. The revolutionary character of this modern point of view creates an almost impassable gulf between us and the Church of the Middle Ages. Again, our methods of interpreting the processes of nature have dissolved the metaphysical teleological methods of the schools. Historical study has given us a new conception of the past and a new attitude towards the future. The present is a link in the whole concatenation of things. If we pass from the sphere of human thought to the sphere of human conduct, we are again confronted with differences and contrasts. New ethical imperatives are involved in the transformation of Western society from its mediaeval forms into the new and highly-organized economic and industrial conditions of contemporary life. The intrinsic excellence of scientific and artistic culture has bestowed moral values upon science and art, and devotion to truth and beauty takes its place alongside the old mediaeval devotion to the good.

It is manifest from considerations such as these that the new world, deeply as it reveres the past, cannot be kept in the leading strings of the past. As Harnack somewhere expresses it, the past must not be for us a burden to be borne, but an inheritance to be used. It is in this sense that the heirs of the Reformation must use what we may describe as the Protestant past. Protestantism in its origins, as Troeltsch reminds us, was not separated from Catholicism by the wide chasm which many Protestants have been brought up to believe. It was living in the same religious atmosphere as Catholicism and asking exactly the same questions.

> 'Protestantism was at first concerned only with the answer to the old question about "Assurance of Salvation" which has its presuppositions in the existence of God, and His personal ethical being, and in general the whole Biblical and mediaeval cosmology; and has as its only pressing problem, how in the face of the condemnation of all men to Hell in consequence of Original Sin, and in view of the weakness and nothingness of all human and creaturely strength, deliverance from judgment, eternal blessedness, and on earth a peace of heart corresponding thereto, can be obtained. This is through and through the old question which the teaching and discipline of Catholicism had impressed more and more deeply on men's hearts. Protestantism, instead of pointing to the hierarchic redemptive organi-

> sation of the Church and its priesthood, and to the *opus operatum* of the sacraments supported by the will, answers the question by pointing to a simple radical and personal decision to believe, which, if it be really made in earnest, can assure itself once for all from the supernatural Divine revelation of the Bible of the forgiveness of sins in Christ, and which on the basis of this certainty produces all the ethical consequences of reconciliation with God and spiritual union with God.'

It was in the interest of the Assurance of Salvation that the doctrine of Predestination became an essential doctrine of Protestantism, and was held with equal tenacity by Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. But it was in Calvinism alone that this mighty doctrine exerted its full power over human life, and imparted to this type of Christianity its heroic force. The man who has been pre-ordained to salvation before the foundation of the world—the man who has been elected, not on account of any merits of his own, but by the inscrutable will of God, feels himself, as Troeltsch expresses it, 'to be the destined lord of the world,' and has it laid upon him to grasp and shape the world. The poet Burns describes this side of Calvinism as he saw it in the eighteenth century in the words of one of the Elect:

> 'Yet I am here, a chosen sample
> To shew Thy grace is great and ample;
> I'm here a pillar in Thy temple
> Strong as a rock.
> A guide, a buckler, an example
> To all Thy flock.'

To the question: 'What about the justice of a scheme of salvation which arbitrarily sends one to heaven and ten to hell?' the answer of Calvinism is that we have no right to ask such a question at all. 'As no man has a claim to be a man rather than a beast, so has no one a claim to be one of the elect rather than one of the damned' (Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen and Gruppen*, p. 615).

It will be seen from these views of Troeltsch as to the nature of primitive Protestantism that this type of Christianity as formulated in the Confessions of Faith of the sixteenth century, is almost as mediaeval as Catholicism, and is incapable of satisfying the religious needs of the modern world. But Protestantism has not stood still. It has produced great creative thinkers in such men as Kant, Schleiermacher, Hegel,

Ritschl, Lotze. All these thinkers rejected the old dogmatic method which claims to be in possession of infallible transcendent verities divinely revealed and guaranteed, and deduces all the details of its theology from them. In opposition to this method they drew the famous distinction between religion and theology, affirming that religious knowledge belongs to the sphere of experience and practice; and that it expresses itself by means of religious symbols. These symbols are far from giving us an adequate conception of the immense realities behind them, but they are the best means we have of attaining an apprehension of the eternal sources of life. All expressions of religious experience which we find in creeds and confessions are of this symbolic character, and they possess religious vitality only in so far as they are capable of being translated into the terms of living religious experience. For a time it seemed as if a fraternal relationship between religion and science had at last been established on this basis, but it was soon seen that the theory of religious symbolism threatened to destroy the historical character of religious truth, and the conflict broke out afresh. It was in the midst of this crisis that Ritschl stepped in and put forward the principle which is the backbone of his school—that Christianity cannot be dissolved into symbols, but has a firm historical basis in divine revelation, the revelation of God in the personality of Jesus Christ.

Troeltsch was a pupil of Ritschl's at the University of Goettingen, and like everyone who came in contact with that remarkable man, he fell under the spell of his forceful personality. But when he in turn became a theological professor at Heidelberg, he emancipated himself from Ritschl's doctrine of the exclusive revelation of God in Christ: and regarding as he did religion as an essential attribute of the human race, he looked upon divine revelation as being as wide as humanity itself. From this point of view Biblical religion, instead of being, as in Ritschl's view, the unique and only revelation, becomes a part of the great religious life of the world. In fact Troeltsch's idea of the nature of revelation is derived from his philosophy of history. This is a department of Troeltsch's thought which it would be impossible for me to develope in the space of a brief article. All I can say is that he emphatically

differentiates historical causation from natural causation. In the natural sciences all qualitative distinctions are ignored: all events are reduced to mere manifestations of energy; whereas in historical causation events are determined not by material but by psychological conditions, and it is not permissible to reduce historical events to non-qualitative forces. At bottom his view of history, while repudiating Hegel's dialectic, is on Hegelian lines, as he himself admits; that is to say, history in its grand lines is the development of the divine reason in the march of events, and is accordingly a form of revelation. His latest book, the second part of which (*Der Historismus*) reached me just after his death, is a work on the philosophy of history. In it he aims at showing that no historical problem is purely historical; it always involves considerations which are essentially philosophical. All historical judgments, as for instance our judgments as to the nature and value of the Christian faith, are in the end resting on philosophical pre-suppositions. This attitude towards history constituted an additional breach between him and the Ritschlian school, with its aversion to the intrusion of philosophy into the domain of religion.

I have left myself little space to say much, far less anything adequate, on a matter which lay very near to Troeltsch's heart —I mean the possible future of liberal Christianity. It is the last essay in the second volume of his collected writings, and to do justice to it would require an article by itself. According to Troeltsch, the liberal Christian faith stands between the old world and the new; upholding the historic religious forces of the old world and combining them into a harmonious whole with the intellectual ethical-social forces of the new. On the possibility of a liberal Christian faith depends the reconciliation of the old world and the new, and the continuity of the spirit of our civilization itself. Should this effort be shattered, the only solution that remains is a complete separation between the new and the old. In this event the spiritual destinies of the future will fall into the hands either of an atheistical scepticism or of some new type of religious belief, the nature of which we cannot possibly foresee. On the other hand, Troeltsch clearly perceives that the liberal religious attitude has great difficulties in front of it. It is a faith which is dependent not upon outward

authority, but on its own inward spiritual sanctions. These sanctions are not the creation of individual or subjective conviction; they are rooted in the collective spiritual heritage of the race. None the less they represent a new type of faith which will require new forms of doctrinal expression; a new ethical and social outlook; and a type of common worship corresponding to new devotional demands. These it is plain are great problems and great tasks, and will no doubt require a long future for their solution. In any event, it is Troeltsch's view that the liberal Christian movement must work within the existing Churches and avoid all mere sectarianism.

In the preceding pages I have presented a very slight sketch of Troeltsch's activities as a Christian thinker, and on several important points, especially on the philosophic side, I have hardly touched on them at all. His critical idealism connects him with the school of Kant, and he develops the religious implications of it on lines of his own, which are perhaps too technical to be dealt with here. Troeltsch was a very many-sided man. He is equally at home as a historian, a philosopher, a theologian. His great historical work on the *Social Doctrines of the Christian Church and Sects* is of as much value and importance as Harnack's *History of Christian Dogma*. It shows that we cannot arrive at a true estimate of the nature of Christianity unless we lay hold of this vast religious movement in its ethical as well as in its dogmatic development. I have in this paper refrained from criticism. The time for criticism of this eminent thinker, as far as the English-speaking world is concerned, has not yet come. We want to know him first, and for most of us he is as yet little more than a name. It seems to me it would be an excellent thing if the members of the recently-appointed Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine were to make themselves acquainted with the work of Troeltsch. No commission on Christian doctrine can afford to ignore his point of view, and the reasons in philosophy and in religious history which have led him to adopt it.

LIBERTY AND DEFINITION

By the Rev. E. J. MARTIN, B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Rastrick.

'IT has been remarked with more ingenuity than truth,' says Gibbon, 'that the virgin purity of the Church was never violated by schism or heresy before the reign of Trajan or Hadrian, about one hundred years after the death of Christ. We may observe with much more propriety that during that period the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude both of faith and practice than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages.'[1]

That is not an unfair description, if that can be called freedom which is enjoyed unconsciously. Among the features of the Gentile Christian communities of the first century Harnack notices these :[2]

(*a*) The want of a fixed doctrinal form in relation to the abstract statement of the faith, and the corresponding variety and freedom of Christian preaching.

(*b*) The want of a clearly defined external authority in the communities, sure in its application, and the corresponding independence and freedom of the individual Christian in relation to the expression of the ideas, beliefs and hopes of faith.

(*c*) The want of a fixed political union of several communities (*i.e.* the one Universal Church as a centralized organization).

(*d*) The existence of a body of Christian writings of authoritative character.

These writings (N.T. and apostolic), were themselves a source of additional independence. The Canon was not fixed. Hermas was as authoritative as St. Paul and different Churches had different collections. The interpretation itself was often a matter of dispute (II *Pt.* iii, 16). Christianity was not a unified body but a series of units inadequately correlated.

Questionable teaching exists and is reprobated even in the N.T. (II *Tim.* ii, 17; *Rev.* ii, 20, etc.), but it is reprobated by

[1] Ed. Bury, Vol. II, p. 13.

[2] *History of Dogma*, E. tr., Vol. I, p. 142.

the individual teacher or the individual community with no recognized standard of judgement, and the heresiarch rejected in one town may not be rejected in another. The evil character of speculative theology steadily increases during the second and third centuries but its significance is only definitely and universally fixed with Arianism when the influence of the State has made any divergence from orthodoxy parallel to rebellion against the Emperor. The State definitely moulded the attitude of the Church to a form which in the preceding 150 years the Church had been gradually shaping itself. But a greater or lesser degree of local toleration was bound to continue until two things happened, (1) the faith was formulated and scientifically expressed, (2) such a faith, made the *articulus constitutionis ecclesiae*, was enforced *universally* by the Church. The spirit which produced these two ends was consciously nursed by a series of Christian leaders, beginning with the Biblical group containing the Pastoral epistles, Jude, John and II Peter, and reaching its climax in Cyprian; the logical end of their policy was achieved through alliance with the State. At the close of the fourth century (380—390) in the East Theodosius incorporates in the law of the Empire a series of enactments against heresy, in the West Maximus condemns to death the Spanish heretic Priscillian for offences concerned only with doctrinal (*i.e.* intellectual) standards. The blood of Priscillian was the seed of the Inquisition.

At the time of the execution of Priscillian and the subsequent action against his followers a strong party which included Martin, Ambrose, Jerome, and the historian Sulpicius Severus protested, but the significant fact is that the influence of the statesmen of the Church, Augustine, Leo, Chrysostom, then, or subsequently was on the side of persecution. This appears to indicate that as Christianity awakens to a consciousness of itself as a systematic religion the two tendencies appear, (1) rigid adherence to a standard ever more definitely formulated, (2) toleration tending to laxity. On the one side are the statesmen to whose genius the organization of Christianity is due and the dynamic which organization has created, on the other the Christian scholar, the Christian philosopher, and the ordinary simple believer. Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyprian,

Leo, Augustine on the one hand, on the other Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Lactantius, Jerome. Valentinus, for example, seems long to have continued a member of the Church and was not greatly reprobated by Clement. Jerome speaks of the Gnostics in the highest terms.

> 'No one can create a heresy unless he has the keenest intellect and is peculiarly gifted by Almighty God; take, for examples, Valentinus and Marcion, who are among the most learned writers we have read; or Bardesanes, whose mind provoked the admiration even of philosophers.' (Hier. *Comm. in Osee,* II, 10.)

But the Church officially moves in another direction. The N.T. group already indicated has begun to formulate a standard of appeal, a rule of faith, 'the pattern of sound words' (II *Tim.* i, 13), 'the sound doctrine' (*Tit.* ii, 1), 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints' (*Jude* 3). Those who fail by this standard are to come, not as yet indeed under the judgement of an official tribunal, but under the censure of the individual official: 'A man that is heretical (not "factious" as RVm, the context suggesting ideas rather than acts) after a first or second admonition refuse.' (*Tit.* iii, 10). The cautious teacher of Christianity in the early second century appeals to the Lord and the Elders as the authority for the faith: so Papias. (Eusebius, *H.E.* III, 39). A little later Hegesippus travels from church to church and tests orthodoxy by 'the law and the prophets and the Lord.' (*ib.* IV. 21, 22). By the end of the second century Irenaeus has established a definite test, the *Kerygma* received from the Apostles and their disciples (*adv. Haer.*, I, x, 1, 2), the Apostolic tradition being authenticated by a succession of bishops. (*adv Haer.*, III, iii, 1-4). Hippolytus some half a century later may be taken as a lucid exponent of this principle; to him the standard of appeal is

> 'The Holy Spirit bequeathed unto the church which the Apostles have transmitted to those who have rightly believed. But we, as being their successors and as participators in this grace, highpriesthood and office of teaching, as well as being reputed guardians of the Church, must not be found deficient in vigilance or disposed to suppress correct doctrine.' (*Ref. omn. Haer,* I. Proem.)

Between Irenaeus and Hippolytus there has been a development. To Irenaeus the Apostolic teaching is self-evident in the teaching of the Church which has a direct descent from an apostolic founder. It scarcely needs interpretation:

> 'Any one who wishes to discern the truth may see in every church in the whole world the Apostolic tradition clear and manifest.'
> (*Adv. Haer.* III, iii, 1).

For Hippolytus a greater emphasis falls on the bishop as the guardian and interpreter of this teaching.

Contemporary with Irenaeus the problem had developed. The apostolic tradition itself had been criticized. Marcion significantly assumed that St. Paul alone gave an apostolic tradition. The teaching of the Twelve was unknown or incompletely known. The confused character of the N.T. canon at this period is evidence in Marcion's favour. Even the O.T. basis of Christianity was shaken by Marcion's attack on allegorical interpretation. This with his criticism of the N.T. canon and his general criticism of the O.T. made inevitable a reconstruction of the rather unstable standard of faith.

The counter attack on the position so ably taken by Marcion is Tertullian's *Praescriptio*. The interpretation of Scripture, says this principle, is the privilege of the Churches of the Apostolic Tradition. Others—heretics—are precluded from handling Scripture at all.

No doubt the full import of Tertullian's principle did not reveal itself immediately. It means of course that the rule of faith is not to be the written word but the Church's interpretation of the written word. This may be good as a principle and Tertullian supports it with the words:

> 'We need no enquiry beyond Jesus Christ, no interrogation past the Gospel.' (*de Praescr,* 7.)

agreeing exactly with the heretic Ptolemaeus:

> 'Our rule is to judge all words by the standard of Jesus.'
> (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxiii.)

But logically there will be no more than one—the official—interpretation; the Church as the guardian of man will be the director of all thought and the position of Cyprian is inevitable:

> 'It is the Church who keeps us for God and appoints unto the kingdom the sons she has borne . . . He who leaves the Church of Christ attains not to Christ's rewards. He is an alien, an outcast, an enemy. He can no longer have God for a father who has not the Church for a mother. If any man was able to escape who remained without the ark of Noah, then will that man escape who is out of doors beyond the Church.' (*de Eccl. unit.* 6.)

The next step is to use the text upon which all attempts to force belief have leaned, 'Compel them to come in,'[3] and to define formulae to serve as tests. The support of the State made both these steps easy. The Faith is defined in the Age of the Councils, and to all the formulated statements anathemas are significantly attached. The spirit of this development is more vividly illustrated by the anathemas than by the definitions. John Wesley says, 'It is a fundamental principle with us that reason and religion go hand in hand.' Such was not the fundamental principle of this stage of developing Christianity. The appeal to reason and to conscience comes first, it is true; but the anathema is in the background, and behind the anathema is the sword by which Priscillian fell. The future policy of the Church emerges from the theories of Augustine. Bluntschli summarizes it: 'When error prevails it is right to invoke liberty of conscience: but when on the contrary the truth predominates it is just to use coercion.'[4]

It is impossible among the abundant follies and not infrequent bigotry of the heresiarchs not to see a great ideal which Catholicism lost, the ideal of intellectual liberty, and a great truth, which Catholicism never fully accepted, the truth that Truth itself is many-sided. Eusebius relates that the Marcionite Apelles said at the end of his life,

> 'Let every man continue in the faith that he has. All who trust in the Crucified will be saved if only they continue doing good.'
> (H.E. v. 13.)

May not this saying still hold good as a basis of unity without the foreclosure of the issue on a single one of the problems which human understanding may open for religion? On the other hand such a basis cannot make for efficiency. The road to efficiency is organization. A church effectively organized must organize thought sooner or later. It is as difficult to combine toleration and efficiency as it is to combine sobriety with freedom to consume intoxicating liquors, yet his policy held the promise of the future, who said he had rather see England free than England sober.

[3] Augustine seems first to have applied this text to support persecution. *Ep.* 185, ¶s. 21 and 25.

[4] Cited by F. Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, E. Tr. p. 27.

A CLERICAL NIMROD

By The Editor.

AT Paris in 1907, at the International Book Exhibition, a volume entitled *The Administration of an Institutional Church* was awarded the gold medal. It was written by Dean Hodges, of the Episcopal Theological School, at Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., and John Reichert, and it contained an Introduction[1] by Theodore Roosevelt, then President of the United States. This book gave an account of the history, development, and organizations of St. George's Church, New York, under the twenty-four years rectorship of the Rev. William S. Rainsford, D.D.

President Roosevelt wrote:

'Every serious student of our social and industrial conditions has learned to look with discomfort and alarm upon the diminishing part which churches play in the life of our great cities—for I need hardly say that no increase in the number of fashionable churches and of wealthy congregations in any shape or way atones for the diminution in the number of the churches in the very localities where there is most need for them. If ever the Christian Church ceases to be the church of the plain people, it will cease to be the Christian Church.

'Dr. Rainsford has stood pre-eminent among the clergymen to whom it has been given to prevent this condition of things from obtaining. His remarkable physical and mental equipment, and the appeal that ethical considerations make to him, put him in the forefront of those both able and eager to do the task. He was keenly alive to everything that appeals to men as men, and his broad and deep sympathies made him keenly sensitive to the needs of others, no less than to the way in which these needs could be effectively met. With such an equipment, he took an empty church and filled it. He filled it with the men and women of the neighbourhood. He made these men and women feel that whether they were rich or poor mattered nothing, so long as they were Christians who tried to live their Christianity in a spirit of brotherly love and of sane, cheerful helpfulness towards themselves and towards one another. He brought the church close to the busy, working life of a great city. With his strong human hand he felt the throbbing pulse of the people among whom he worked, and he fired their hearts with the spirit that was in his own. As a preacher, as an executive, as a citizen among his fellow-citizens, Dr. Rainsford made St. George's Church the most notable institution of its kind in the world. He did lasting work for social and civic righteousness. Not only New York City but the Nation as a whole owes him a debt of gratitude for his moulding of American citizenship in the form in which it should be cast. The kind of citizenship for the upbuilding of which he laboured, is that which rests its sense of duty to city and country on the deep and broad foundation of the eternal laws of spiritual well-being.'

[1] Dated 7th April, 1906.

The remarkable man who accomplished this great work has just written his autobiography. He calls it *The Story of a Varied Life.*[2]

We could wish that every clergyman might read it, and many who are not. It is the most interesting and stimulating clerical life which has appeared since that of Canon Barnett.

Yet when we call this book a clerical life, which indeed it is, we must confess that we do not recall any other clerical life at all like it. The active parochial organiser and the earnest evangelical preacher is not often a Nimrod who in the company of redskins has hunted buffalo in 'the wild and woolly West.' William Rainsford was a born sportsman and he carried his sporting instincts into his clerical life. Of William Rufus it was said, he loved the red deer like a brother. This, in the light of history, is rather an understatement of his affection for the red deer; and of William Rainsford it may be truly said that a deep, great-hearted, discerning love of his fellow-men is the real secret of his wonderful success.

Born of gentle Irish blood, the son of an admirable Evangelical clergyman, he was reared in a good home. By singular good fortune the *res angusta domi* was brightened by country sports and social privileges. Delicate health necessitated a stay in the South of Europe before he proceeded to St. John's College, Cambridge. Here he took a Pass Degree, but had the advantage of attending Lightfoot's lectures. He went to no theological college. He presented himself for ordination to Dr. Pelham, Bishop of Norwich. Except for the kind heart and wise insight of the Bishop he would have been rejected, as he did very badly in his Deacon's examination.

Ordained to a curacy in Norwich itself, he eagerly took up street preaching, and then conducted evangelical missions in Canada and the United States. In charge at St. James' Cathedral, Toronto, he won recognition. There Professor Goldwin Smith became one of his supporters, and wrote to him many years afterwards: 'Come of the Creeds what will, you are keeping the religion of Jesus alive in New York.' When owing to the Bishop's opposition he was prevented from succeeding

[2] *The Story of a Varied Life,* an Autobiography by W. S. Rainsford, published by Doubleday, Page and Co., U.S.A., price 5 dollars net (1922).

to the rectorship, he accepted that of St. George's Church, New York.

St. George's at that time was derelict. It possessed, however, a vestry who loved it, and had the insight not only to invite Mr. Rainsford to become rector, but to accept his uncompromising conditions of rectorship.

> 'First, you must make the church absolutely free. Buy out those who will not donate their pews. Second, abolish all committees in the church except the vestry, and only reappoint such as I shall name. Third, I must have an annual fund of 10,000 dollars for three years, independent of my salary, to spend as I see fit on church work. My salary I leave to you.' Dead silence followed. I saw Mr. Morgan look round that circle of tense faces. Then he looked full at me and said one word: "Done".'

The 'Mr. Morgan' was Mr. Pierpont Morgan, the multimillionaire, of whom his rector tells much that interests and charms. The choice was as wise as it was brave. Personality is the one incalculable and unconquerable factor in human history—the perpetual worker of miracles because it is the throne of the Creative Spirit of God. Under the inspiration of Dr. Rainsford's personality the derelict parish became the most remarkable in the Anglican communion.

We cannot in this article do more than direct attention to Dr. Rainsford's ideals and convictions, for these are the very sinews of the soul. Varied and important as have been the experiences of his outward life, it is the growth of his inner life which seems to Dr. Rainsford to be even more significant.

> 'Waking, dreaming, rejoicing, suffering,' he writes, 'the questions of the soul are with us ever. Yes, our poor little visions are dear to us, because they have cost us dearly, and when we are obliged to give them up, and change them for others, we only relinquish them with sorrow and bitter pain. This I know to be true. Why, then, when a life's story is told, should it deal with a man's adventures in every field of endeavour and make no record of the conflict of his very soul? What is God? Is there anything in us that shall survive death? What is and is not sin? What is real righteousness? What does the life of Jesus mean? How much of our record of it is true? How do the other supermen of our race stand related to Him? These are the realest and most pressing of all questions, and all men who think are ever debating them inwardly. Why then be silent as to that debate?'

Let us then trace that inner life with the formation and growth of its convictions. Dr. Rainsford writes:

> 'Religion was everything to my parents. In daily life they consistently presented its beautiful reality to their children. They lived

in the company of a God they loved and trusted. The incongruity of the doctrines they held with the life they lived and the love they gave was, of course, not apparent to me till long after.'

'We children were taught:—

1. That the nature of all men born of Adam was altogether vile; no particle of good in it.
2. That the world we lived in was under God's curse and was to be burned up.
3. That it was God's eternal purpose to save a few out of it.
4. That the great majority of its inhabitants were destined to suffer eternally in a real hell fire.

People no longer believe these awful doctrines, you say. Why repeat them? Why dwell on the darker side of a religious movement which you confess had much good in it and profoundly benefitted its time? I do so because . . . one of my chief reasons for writing is to insist on the comparative unimportance of creeds and doctrines. If true religion is to live, and men cannot live without it, their creeds must change and doctrines once precious and useful perish' (p. 34).

Was this the Evangelical Gospel, if such it can be called, that Rainsford, the evangelist, began to preach? No doubt it was at first presupposed, but what was preached was a gospel of hope, and strength, and love. He tells us that it was 'the message of pardon for the sinner that repented, and new strength, and hope for the reborn man,' and he adds that in the light of his life's experience:

'However necessary it may be to modify the methods used in stating it, so as to commend it to the consciences of men and make it fit in with the learning of the times, *I am convinced it will ever remain the central core, the living, growing seed core of the Gospel of the Universal Jesus*' (p. 134).

Up to now he had done little reading. He had studied humanity, but not in books. He now began to read Robertson's *Life* and *Sermons*, Mazzini's writings, Matthew Arnold's poetry, Tennyson's *In Memoriam*. He did not experience their full force all at once, but as he remarks, they 'did not fit in with the absolutely verbal inspiration of an inerrant book.' He sent off Robertson's *Life* to his sister, but it never reached her, because as he said, 'My dear good father commandeered it and burnt it.'

Of Mazzini, who has not yet come to his own, although Garibaldi and Cavour have inherited theirs, he writes:

'I rediscovered Mazzini. I cannot overstate what I owe to Mazzini. He has to my mind a truer, saner hold on the real scope and meaning of the religion of Jesus as it should be applied to modern life than any great teacher, any public figure of his time. His faith was profound, not in God only, but in man . . . All sorts of men,

wise and foolish, learned and simple, offered to the Nineteenth Century their theories of social reform. Mazzini was the greatest figure of them all. Steadily, with an inflexible courage in which there was no taint of egoism, he trod his high and lonely way, his enemies many and powerful, his friends often few, and they but partially understanding him. Ceaselessly he strove for the Christianizing of politics. Religion as he saw and practised it was nowhere more necessary than in so-called secular affairs; for Christianity was no individual matter; it was the very soul of public duty. For man's relations to his fellow-man could never be just, peaceful and harmonious till in business and politics he based his actions on its law of loving, believing, selfless service.'

So the process of theological development began in Rainsford, but where did it end?

It is well worth while to try and get a clear view of Dr. Rainsford's creed, for with him it is no traditional shibboleth but a body of fundamental, and let us add, of functioning, and fruitful convictions.

What are these fundamental convictions? First, Dr. Rainsford has a deep belief in God, the Father,—undefined and undefinable—the reality in a Universe 'back of which is justice and right.'

Speaking of the Church, he says:

'If she believes that God is for man and in man, a mighty creative and recreative power, *ever pushing all things on—the free to a freer, the just to a juster, the good to a better*—then her acts must show that she believes in a present guidance of the affairs of men, as in the past. In short, a present and active Holy Ghost. The church that shows signs of this sort of life will not fail either of a hearing or of influence' (p. 354).

Dr. Rainsford believes in Jesus Christ as the supreme organ of the Divine Revelation to man, but he does not view that revelation as completed in the past. Comparing his earlier life with his later views of Revelation, he writes:

'I did not see then that the revelation of God to man was not, and till man ceased to be man, never could be, a finished revelation, its record bound within the covers of one incomparably great book, but must ever be a continuous process. Moreover, that revelation must be continuously made by men to men, and not by one man only, not even by one Jesus Christ, but by many men in many nations, and in many religions—the Lord Jesus being the chief of God's revealers, "the chief among ten thousand and the altogether lovely."

'Small wonder that I did not then see this, for it is only here and there that an accredited minister in any Protestant denomination yet sees this axiomatic truth. But a short time ago to preach that view of Jesus' revelation cost a man summary trial for heresy and expulsion from any orthodox Christian church' (p. 117).

But let there be no mistake as to the place to which he assigns our Lord. It is above every name that is named. He writes (p. 309):—

> 'The old altars are falling. Let us build the new, and over them let us place the everlasting name of Jesus, the Supreme Servant of Mankind.
>
> 'He chose His own altar. It was a cross; and at that altar mankind will worship long after it has ceased to believe in or to honour the impossibly partial, unworshipful God that all the orthodoxies still persist in presenting to it to-day.'
>
> Oh, King of Earth, thy cross ascend,
> O'er climes and ages 'tis thy throne.

Dr. Rainsford believes in a social gospel. The Evangelical Gospel of his youth was individualistic. He writes:

> 'But, as I see now, the very nature and scope of the gospel we held and taught tended to weaken and isolate us. It was a purely individualistic message we delivered; good as far as it went, but it did not go far enough; half of a great truth, but only half. Save your soul alive: this is the one thing worth doing. Jesus' religion as we held it went no further. Preaching that in season and out of season, talking ever and always about it as we did, never sitting next a stranger in the omnibus or railroad-car without talking it, never dining at a friend's table and leaving it out—I don't exaggerate—this *was the steadily pursued habit of a considerable body of able and earnest men at the time I am speaking of.* Literally an "in season and out of season" appeal "whether they would hear or whether they would forbear," and it meant a power. But this sort of religious zeal, these methods of religious activity, made naturally for Individualism' (p. 120).

One of the causes why the Church has lost the working classes is due to her neglect in various critical issues to preach the social Gospel of justice and brotherhood in clear, strong tones. Of this Dr. Rainsford was a fearless preacher. In consequence, rich men left his congregation, but not, it is interesting to note, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, as the following incident indicates:

> 'A reporter coming early, was shown to a seat high up the church. He noticed that that morning Mr. Morgan had some difficulty in getting any seat at all. When the service was over, the reporter buttonholed the usher and said, "How do the old St. George's people, like Mr. Morgan there, stand this sort of thing?" "Oh," said the usher, "most of the old stand-bys have gone away long ago, and those that remain will stand anything"' (p. 225).

Yet Dr. Rainsford is no believer in the dictatorship of the proletariat. He writes:

> 'I did not then, I do not now, believe in enforced trade unionism. The labour movement has made great advances since those days—some in a totally wrong direction. There was no limitation of output then, and little of the trickery, bribery, violence and crime that have

played so large a part in the modern labour movement. Capitalism sought to force its will on the nation: it failed. Labour unionism faithfully followed its example, as was natural for it to do so. It, too, must surely fail' (p. 328).

Also unlike many social workers he does not believe in making people moral by legislation. He writes:

'The big things in our lives, the lovely things, the things that lift us above our lower selves, are not law-born, but are free loyalties. Not a multitude of obediences that are forced, but voluntary compacts that are free' (p. 333).

Dr. Rainsford believes greatly in the Christian Church and in the ministry of preaching. The function of the Church is pre-eminently to guide, inspire, and teach.

'If the Church believes in the promise of her Master, if she believes in the ever-living, inspiring spirit of God, as she professes to do, let her give some evidence of it that men can see. Orderly services, stately ritual, and persistent declarations of the obvious are not enough. She must show she can guide by having clergy and lay people in her ranks who *are* guides; that she can teach by having teachers in her pulpits, her colleges, and her seminaries who *are* teaching. The Church has one duty, one she cannot depute: that is to educate the children of God. To educate she must understand; to understand that she must sympathize; to sympathize she must know. What avails it to insist she has divine guidance if, perpetually, she is silent on those things men and women are debating in their inmost souls? If she would show the world any real desire to recast her creeds and dogmas in terms of to-day, frankly recognizing that historic and scientific learning have made a restatement necessary, multitudes would turn to her with fresh hope and a new obedience. But this is a difficult thing for any and all of the orthodox churches now to do. They are hampered by their past course of action. The root mistake they have made, and none of them have made it quite so persistently as has the Protestant Episcopal Church, has been in the diverting of this divinely entrusted work of the teacher into an assumption of a religious control over the taught. Not so much a patient purpose to seek and find spiritual values, as a growing will to impose a doctrinal and sacramental system; *an assumption of power, rather than a seeking for truth*' (p. 354).

It is not surprising that Dr. Rainsford became a great preacher when preaching seemed to him, as the following extract shows, so much worth while.

'Better and more lasting than books or plays or pictures is the work of a preacher who lives among his people, though to the unobservant it seems to have little permanence. He reaches hosts of people who, for one or another cause—want of time, or want of education, or want of taste—are not greatly influenced by them. The writer offers them facts; the dramatist, life; and the artist, beauty—in vain. But the preacher, himself susceptible to the most vital currents of his time, receives and gives forth. It is as natural and necessary to him as breathing. And with what he gives goes a certain

subtle something; something of himself he gives to those he reaches. He may not know it, nor may his hearers, but long after he has passed on and is forgotten, that seed of his own life grows and yields fruit in the lives of other men. *Is that not worth doing?* I say you can do more good, you can see more good, yes, and in a not unworthy sense you can have yourself a better time in the ministry than in any other profession on earth' (p. 398).

And although he has many painful things to say about his own branch of the Anglican Church and of that Church generally, yet he believes in her.

'And now one short closing word about my own dear church. In spite of the fact that it has become a class church, try to enter its ministry. The Protestant Episcopal Church was not intended to be a class church. In spite of its *safe* policies and *safe* bishops, in spite of its system of representative government that makes a farce of representative government, press into it, stay in it, and from *within* fight to reform and liberalize it.

'We are in but "the morning of the times." We are on the eve of great events. I long to see that church which should be the most comprehensive of all Christian churches, *for she represents a main current of the religious evolution of the most comprehending and comprehensive of the world's great races,* take the place, that by right of her great past, is hers. She should inspire and guide the hearts of men in the great new days coming as she did in the great days of old. But if she would do so, she must find, equip and commission the preacher' (p. 398).

'The old sailor loves his ship: he has weathered many a storm in her, and she has carried for him many a cargo . . . Creeds and dogmas take a long time to grow, and a long time to die. It is doubtful if the most effective religious teachers of our day could find even now a place in the orthodox pulpits of our land. Certainly Royce, the greatest Christian philosopher Harvard has produced, couldn't. But the light spreads: that is the nature of the light; and the truth grows a little less dim: that is the nature of truth; and the number of men of *"good-will"* is increasing in our old world. And so approaches a better day, when we shall be judged to have failed or succeeded in our life's task, in so far as we have failed or succeeded in *revealing* a reasonable, a ruling, and a lovable God to those around us . . . Once the Church led men to the light. To-day, too commonly, there is more darkness in the Church than in the world she claims to lead and save' (p. 117).

'The Church is holding back from the complete reinterpretation of all her doctrines that an acceptance of Evolution must involve. But since she must face such a reinterpretation, hesitation is disastrous to herself and to the world. The docile and obedient multitudes she once commanded are slowly melting away, while to other increasing multitudes the forms and phrasing of popular Christian statement are becoming unsatisfactory or intolerable.

'For myself, so far as the Protestant Episcopal Church is concerned, I feel like saying, "I do believe in the Church of one hundred years hence"' (p. 349).

'But the cause of error and of consequent weakness lies deeper than this admitted inability of the clergy to explain.

'It lies in their mistaken concept of the nature of Religious Truth itself. They view "the faith once delivered to the saints as a golden brick, not as a living, growing, flowering, fruiting seed, which Jesus said it was.

'They insist on the accurate, complete, final statement of the Truth. If they would but stop and think, pause long enough to read a little history, two things would be evident to them. First, that a "finished" truth is, from the very nature of truth, a lie. And next, that it invariably becomes not a passive, harmless sort of lie, but an active lie; in short, an idol . . . ' (p. 348).

Dr. Rainsford believes in the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. How refreshingly strong he is in his faith in the Divine Incarnation in the human race. Why is this? Because he believes both in God and in man. He writes:

'Nothing so clearly proves to me the unconquerable religiousness of our human nature as does the growth within us all of the spirit of unselfishness which is the spirit of Jesus. To me it is quite certain that every testing time that comes to us proves that our acts are less marked by selfishness and self-seeking than were those of our fathers. A personal salvation is no longer a righteous and legitimate aim. Rewards offered to us for holiness achieved pall on us. We see, if we look squarely at life, men and women everywhere, outside religious organizations quite as commonly as within them, gladly giving their lives to advance the cause of truth, or to better the condition of others, whose claim on their self-sacrifice is but that of a common humanity. This immense and irrefutable spiritual advance of man I take to be the evidence of the coming of the Kingdom of God on this earth.

'It is the spiritual work of a spiritually free people, striving for the best they know. Once again I quote my own definition of religion, as specially applicable here: '*It is the giving of the best we have to the best we know.*"—And this is not done for reward' (p 381).

'The supreme wonder of life is man himself—man, a little child of God. What he has done, and is, and knows, is but a poor hint of what he shall do, shall know, and shall be; man, God's last, best and so far as we know, final expression of Himself. To realize the greatness of ourselves is not to minify God, but to magnify Him' (p. 383).

These are Dr. Rainsford's fundamental convictions: these he proclaimed by his voice and by his work in season and out of season for a number of years in the face of opposition and misconception, but with extraordinary influence for good.

We do not believe that Church statistics are by any means a sure guide to spiritual and moral influence, nevertheless they have a way of creating a definite impression on the modern mind. Hence it may be well to state that between 1883 and 1899 the communicants in his parish increased from under two hundred to over four thousand, and there might be 1,500 or more at a communion service. The money raised was two million dollars during that period. But our readers must go to

Dr. Rainsford's autobiography to get some idea of the spirit of fellowship and service which permeated his parishioners and fellow-workers.

As we lay this thrilling volume down, we are conscious that we have given our readers but a very poor idea of its contents, of the delightful strength, and sincerity, and humanity, and pure emotion, and many lights on many things which it discloses, but we ask ourselves, what we hope is not an improper question: Why did not this man become a bishop in the Anglican communion? What a bishop he would have made! The answer is not hard to find. He writes:

> 'The Episcopate was twice a possibility for me. That, of course, was in the early days of my ministry, before I had time to say or do anything in particular, and before I was tagged a heretic' (p. 124).

He writes again:

> 'I tried to do as well as I could, with such faulty educational and mental outfit as I possessed, what most of the clergy were afraid to attempt at all. I tried, and kept trying, to recast, to restate the Church's orthodox doctrines. For such restatement intelligent lay people were everywhere hungry, and to satisfy that hunger I did my poor best. It was this quality in my preaching more than any other, that drew to me my people. Of this I had constant proof' (p. 261).

It was this which ruined his episcopal prospects. He writes:

> 'A large number of the clergy of the diocese headed by the Rev. Floyd Tompkins, of Trinity Church, Philadelphia (Phillip Brook's old church), in their zeal for orthodoxy urged the Bishop of Pennsylvania to try me for heresy' (p. 117).

Somewhat later he writes:

> 'In New York, the difficulty of the task I had set myself to accomplish, and the novelty of it, served to shield me during those first years from clerical criticism. But it was inevitable that as it came to be understood, the radical nature of the doctrine taught in St. George's should draw fire; and for many years I was pretty close to a heresy trial at any time' (p. 372).

What was his heresy in the eyes of his fellow-churchmen? Chiefly, apparently, that he did not believe in the Virgin Birth and physical Resurrection of our Lord. He became convinced that these beliefs, natural enough in their origin and development, caused misconception in the modern mind as to the reality and nature of the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ. Dr. Rainsford writes, and the whole trend of modern literary and historical criticism supports his view:

> 'He (Jesus) was under all the conditions not only of humanity, but of the humanity of his time and place. So much was essential to a true incarnation . . . The more convincedly we believe in the in-

> carnation the more strongly must we hold to the conditions and limitations of it; without them the Incarnation is not real. Where, then, is the Divineness? It is in the perfection of his obedience, and the resulting absoluteness of his moral and spiritual verdicts' (p. 374).

It was such thoughts and utterances as these concerning the mode of the Incarnation—not its reality, for if Dr. Rainsford did not see God 'in the face of Jesus Christ,' to use St. Paul's phrase, he saw Him nowhere—that caused him to be depreciated as a heretic. Yet it was his faith in God as seen in Jesus Christ, which caused this devoted worker to seek the children of God in the slums of New York. In the light of spiritual and moral values it seems to us appalling that his fellow-clergy should have been so blinded by their worship of the traditionalist orthodoxy as to wish to prosecute so splendid a Christian worker, because his views of the mode of Christ's Incarnation were not those which tradition has sanctioned in the Church. Can we conceive that Christ Himself values such views at all? Can we feel, notwithstanding the obsessions of our dogmatists, that the views which reverent and thoughtful men take of these matters are of any importance whatsoever compared with the moral and spiritual qualities of the men themselves, or that in our estimate of suitability for ministerial office in the Church of Christ anything should count in comparison with those great qualities of Christlike personality by which men are won to rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things?

When we view Dr. Rainsford's career in this light, and see how this false idol of a traditional orthodoxy was valued by his clerical contemporaries above the Holy Spirit enshrined in his personality, we might well despair of the Anglican Church, if we did not believe that she is already exchanging false values for true.

Dr. Rainsford's publishers present his Autobiography to the American public with the following encomium on its cover, and one which the contents of the volume justify:

> 'Dr. Rainsford, the great preacher, reformer, hunter, traveller, and friend of humanity, has set forth in this volume, with that fearlessness for which he was noted in the pulpit, his reactions to the vastly various men, events, and movements with which he came in vital contact during a long and varied career.
>
> 'He recounts the outstanding events of his life from his boyhood in Ireland to his rectorship of St. George's Church in New York, one of the greatest parishes in America.'

Yet how strange that this man so loyal to Jesus Christ, so full of His Spirit, such a telling preacher of God's righteousness, so wonderful in his power to win his fellow man to nobler living, should be counted unfit to be in the highest rank of the Christian ministry. It is strange, but only too true. Because this man was brave and fearless, because he was sincere and thoughtful, because, as he tells us, that in his loyalty to Christ the Truthbringer, he never 'hedged' on any doctrinal or on any moral issue, because in the light of modern criticism he abandoned much of the traditional creed, he was viewed with suspicion by his fellow-clergymen. Nay, more, because he was an uncompromising but discerning critic of Church methods and Church ideals, although, as we have shown, an understanding and sincere lover of the Anglican Communion, there were many who felt that it would be much better that he should be outside the ministry of the Church than within it. He writes:

> 'When I have an attack of the "blues" I find myself sometimes wondering if I was right in seeking ordination, and entering the ministry of the national Church of England. I was in many ways unfitted for the clerical profession as it was and still is popularly conceived of. Anyone can see this who has followed my story. At the time I did not realize this, but how often do any of us realize what we are binding ourselves to when we enter any profession? A sense of my unfitness has constantly grown on me. Yet, by the time one has gauged one's powers, gauged the varying brakes and obstructions, some of them almost intolerable, on freedom of speech or of action, incidental to a clergyman's life, there has arisen to balance it a sense of the loss and hurt to others any surrender of that calling must entail' (p. 125).

How much would have been lost had this man not been a clergyman, nevertheless the very history of that great career will lead men of strong personality to hesitate to seek Orders in the English Church. Yet while the Church needs such men, she is failing more and more to get them as Dr. Rainsford sees clearly.

> 'To-day, the tragedy of it is, that *the little fellows get in and the larger ones stay out*' (p. 126).

What is the remedy? We give it in his words.

> 'Of this I am sure: that easier, freer, more natural ways must be found within my own church and *all churches* for the using of men and women eminently fitted to instruct and stimulate their fellows, specially those called to preach, without the hampering imposition of old and irrelevant doctrinal tests and creeds' (p. 126).

THREE IDEALS OF CHRISTIANITY

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford.
Author of *Religion and Science from Galileo to Bergson.*

CATHOLICISM. Like the mustard-plant of the parable, Catholicism is an organism, and has grown by a process of assimilation. As the seed and growing plant extracts from its environment alien and diverse material which it transmutes by subtle metabolism into its own substance, so the Catholic Church has absorbed a variety of strange elements. The organic analogy would lead us to expect that an analysis of Catholicism should yield a heterogeneous collection of constituents. And such in fact has been the result of historical and anthropological research; Catholicism turns out to have been, or rather still to be, a 'syncretistic religion.' Some Catholic beliefs and practices turn out to be of pagan or even of barbarous origin—Greek mysteries, pagan cults, Oriental theosophies, even primitive magical rites, contributed to create Catholic Christianity. But as an organism is something distinct from, and different in quality to, the various materials that enter into its structure, so the Church is something more than an illogical accumulation of cults and superstitions.

Thus the philosophic Catholic may look on the diversity and heterogeneity of his religion as a glory rather than as a reproach. In the first place he may feel that to be a Catholic is to possess a sense of solidarity with a large part of the religious and artistic culture of the world at every age, and so to rise above any nice exclusiveness or narrow sectarianism. In the second place he may realize that the more heterogeneous and diverse are the elements absorbed by his religion, the wider will be the appeal it is likely to make; for every type of individual will find something to satisfy him in it. Here peasant and philosopher will be equally at home; here will be waters where lambs may drink and elephants may swim. His will be a religion for every sort of human being, and not merely for a religious, ethical, or intellectual aristocracy.

Furthermore, a syncretistic, or 'natural,' religion not only meets the spiritual and intellectual needs of all sorts and conditions of men, but it is also a *religion of the whole man.* Not the mind only, nor the conscience only, nor the senses only, nor the emotions only, can find their satisfaction here. Every side of man's complex nature (and how complex that is we are only beginning to understand) has contributed to the synthesis, and can select from it what it needs. In a religion as many-sided as humanity no human interest is unrepresented, or forgotten, or despised, for *Humani nihil a me alienum puto* is the ideal of Catholicism. Hence Catholicism has sometimes been successful in creating, in unpromising individuals and societies, a basis of spiritual and moral life, where more exotic systems have failed. As one who knew the strength and weakness of the Catholic system says :

> 'Catholicism refuses to despise the half because it is not the whole. Whereas in the bare-walled conventicles of reason, if the soul cannot do her best, she can do nothing, in a Catholic church the soul can do her second best or her third; there are altars to visit, beads to finger, litanies to mutter, and the crucifix to gaze on, and a hundred little occupations not less good because others may be so much better.[1]

So that Catholicism may be said to stand as the religion of all types of men as against the eclecticisms of cranks and faddists; and also as the religion of the whole man as against the pedantry of a purely reasonable religion, the Manichaeanism of the ascetic, the moral rigorism of Puritanism.

Needless to say, the ideal of Catholicism has, like all other ideals, suffered a large measure of obscuration or dilution. So as to ensure its universality, there has been a tendency to level down the standard of attainment, and to remain satisfied with, or even to encourage and foster, an ignorance and superstition which should have given place to something better. But the chief corruption of the ideal has been that which naturally threatens all centralized institutions, civil and religious. Ecclesiastical bureaucrats have used their powers to tyrannize over the minds and consciences of the faithful; the imperial interests of a corporation have taken precedence over everything.

With regard to the other troubles and diseases of Catholicism, they seem naturally to arise from its organic constitu-

[1] Tyrrell, *Through Scylla and Charybdis,* p. 32.

ion. The laws which operate in the organic sphere are laws of change and development, of metabolism and adaptation. These laws do not involve alteration of individuality; the changing organism remains the same organism, but 'to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.' The wholesome operation of these laws has oftentimes been artificially restricted by those whom ignorance or timidity or self-interest has rendered blind. The attempt has been made to petrify with the immobility of death the living and developing organism, with disastrous results. For it is a superficial view which supposes that change means instability. In the organic sphere, at any rate, the two things are distinguishable, and are even opposites. For it is not the living organism, with its ever-changing cells, that is unstable, but the dead organism where metabolism has been succeeded by corruption.

There is a further characteristic of organisms which displays itself also in Catholicism. An organism not only assimilates new material from outside, but it also excretes its waste products; otherwise it would become clogged and poisoned. Some of the troubles which afflict the health of the Church arise from defective or sluggish excretion; the body is in need of a purge.

Then again, an organism may become anaemic and enfeebled, either owing to misfortune or misconduct. Similarly, Catholicism may take on a kind of starved anaemic appearance and lapse into a narrow, peevish, selfish pietism, good neither for the land, nor yet for the dunghill, but men cast it out. It makes life neither sweeter nor better, but imports into the world a wearisome type of petulant, morbid, and neurotic religiosity, displaying the very worst features of puritanism without the vigorous masculinity of the latter, and its stern zeal for social and political righteousness.

Catholicism has been called the feminine, as Protestantism has been called the masculine, element in Christianity. There may be some measure of truth expressed here; the less attractive side of the feminine character is certainly displayed in some types of Catholicism.

Its aberrations, however, should not stultify a system; and the advantages of the Catholic system are, as we have seen, neither unreal nor inconspicuous. A system which has its roots

so deep in human history and in human nature, can endure a great deal of abuse and mismanagement without being in any serious danger of collapse, otherwise, of course, Catholicism would not be with us to-day. That it has survived is certainly not due to its friends, nor to its imitators.

PROTESTANTISM. 'The word is very nigh thee, in thy heart and in thy mouth.' This declaration of the possession of divine truth by the individual summarizes the ideal of Protestantism. It expresses the principle that the individual can find his moral and spiritual salvation apart from all external institutional mediation. It is true that the principle has received some recognition by individual Catholics, but the authorities have discouraged eccentricities of that sort. Molinos' *Spiritual Guide* was found to have the result of discouraging attendance at Mass and the practice of confession, and the author ended his days in a dungeon. He had written with the object of 'breaking the fetters' which hindered the soul's upward flight, but unfortunately he broke some of the leading strings by which the Roman priesthood desired to direct the laity.[2]

The view of religion which regards it as direct communion between the Soul and God, and between God and the Soul, tends to hold priests and sacraments rather cheap, or at least to regard them as by no means indispensable adjuncts to religion. The good William Tyndall speaks thus of the 'Sacrament of Penance':

> 'Shrift in the ear is verily a work of Satan; and that the falsest that ever was wrought, and that most hath devoured the faith . . . A Christian man is a spiritual thing; and hath God's Word in his heart, and God's Spirit to certify him of all things. He is not bound to come to any ear.'

Again, for Tyndall and for those who thought as he did, priesthood, if it existed at all, was universal:

> 'And as good is the prayer of a cobbler as that of a cardinal, and of a butcher as of a bishop; and the blessing of a baker that knoweth the truth is as good as the blessing of our most holy father the pope.[3]

[2] See Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 232. *Cf.* Bishop Burnet, who says of the Molinists, 'They were not so assiduous at Mass, nor so earnest to procure Masses to be said for their friends; nor were they so frequently either at confession or in procession, so that the trade of those that live by these things was terribly sunk.'

[3] *Obedience of a Christian Man*, 'Of Penance' and 'Of Order.'

Protestantism appeals, then, to an interior touch with God, which every Christian man may share. St. Augustine himself expressed the ideal of Protestantism when he cried :

> 'I searched through all the world, O God, and I found Thee not; I returned into myself and there I found Thee.'

Such is the message distinctive of Protestantism; that within the shrine of the heart there dwells the Spirit of God, and that he who seeks, finds.

Protestantism presents its purest and most logical expression in Quakerism; the Friend, like the psalmist, communes with his own heart, and is still. All the outward machinery of religion can be dispensed with by him: these things are veils which hide God. Sebastian Franck looked forward to a Church

> 'Which will dispense with external preaching, ceremonies, sacraments, bann and office as unnecessary.'[4]

The religious problem, then, for Protestantism is not a cosmological problem, nor yet an institutional problem, but a personal problem. The ultimate question is : What are the relations between the individual soul and God? This was the question to which Luther's great doctrine of Justification by Faith was an answer. The significance of that doctrine is that a man is justified not by his works, still less by the magic of a cultus, but by his personal attitude towards God. Indeed, Luther practically says as much :

> 'A Capuchin says: wear a grey coat and a hood, a rope round thy body, and sandals on thy feet. A Cordelier says: put on a black hood; an ordinary Papist says: do this or that work, hear mass, pray, fast, give alms, &c. But a true Christian says: I am justified only by faith in Christ, without any works or merits of my own; compare these together, and judge which is the true righteousness.'[5]

The essential strength of Protestantism lies in its vigorous faith in individual liberty, in freedom for the inner man; not Epictetus himself could insist more upon the sanctity of human personality, and its independence of circumstance.

> 'Be of good courage,' says Luther, 'and think, that henceforward thou art not the child of a human creature, but of God, through faith in Christ, in whose name thou art baptised; therefore the spear of death cannot enter into thee; he has no right unto thee, much less can he hurt or prejudice thee, for he is everlastingly swallowed up through Christ.'[6]

[4] Quoted by Rufus Jones, *Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries*, p. 49. [5] *Table Talk*, CCCVI. [6] *Ibidem*, DCXXXV.

Indeed, the independence and freedom which Luther's words suggest are far more deeply rooted and secure than anything that the Stoic experienced, for they were based upon a lively and genuine consciousness of 'election,' supplemented in certain cases by 'sensible conversion,' which was a real experience that to-day, perhaps, few people are competent to understand.

MODERNISM. Modernism is based not on any philosophic presuppositions, but rather upon the study of history, anthropology, psychology, and biological and physical science. But it is the study of the first of these sciences that has been the chief factor in creating the Modernist attitude.

The history of Christianity reveals a number of successive attempts on the part of Christians to express their fundamental convictions about the meaning, value, and method of existence. The first such attempt seems to have been made when the Christian Gospel was transplanted from the Jewish soil in which it originated to the Greek soil in which it afterwards flourished. We see the successful result of this attempt in the Fourth Gospel. This expression of the Christian message (*i.e.* the Christian belief about the meaning, value, and method of existence) was further elaborated by the Christian Neoplatonists of Alexandria in the third century. Clement and Origen interpreted the Christian message in terms of the best thought of their time, so that Christianity, besides being vital as a religious experience, was also convincing as a philosophic system. At this period head and heart were at one.

It is too often forgotten that there is no good reason to suppose that this habit of continual re-interpretation would ever have been interrupted had it not been for the abrupt and complete collapse of civilization in the sixth century. Culture, learning and religion itself were all overwhelmed by a flood of barbarism, and theology, which had hitherto been active, was suddenly smothered. When thought revived again (which it only did slowly and painfully), thinkers again set themselves to the task which the barbarian invasions had interrupted. Thought came to life even among the barbarians themselves. That solitary genius of the ninth century, Scotus Erigena, as

one born out of due time, need not detain us, but Anselm in the eleventh century, and Abelard in the twelfth, took up the task where the Fathers had been compelled to lay it down. The latter came in for much criticism from the Traditionalists of his day. Twice he was condemned for heresy, at the Synod of Soissons in 1121, and at Sens in 1141, when saintly but conservative Bernard stirred up the prelates of France.[7]

Yet 'the intellect of the age was with Abelard; and the heresy of one generation became the orthodoxy of the next.' His pupil, Peter the Lombard, who 'shared Abelard's most serious deviation from Catholic teaching,' subsequently became Bishop of Paris, and 'lived to be consulted by a Pope on a question of theology, and to see his *Sentences* already becoming the very Canon of Orthodoxy for succeeding ages.'[8]

An even more conspicuous example of the successful employment of the Modernist method in theology occurred in the thirteenth century, when an entire transformation of the intellectual basis of Christianity was effected by Albertus Magnus and his more famous pupil Thomas Aquinas. This task was rendered necessary by a flood of non-Christian Aristotelianism with which the natural science of that day was closely associated, and which was almost an exact counterpart of materialistic Naturalism to-day. In spite of the misgivings of contemporary obscurantism (in 1228 Pope Gregory IX condemned the Modernism of Aquinas), the secular culture of the day was baptized into Christ by the intellectual courage of the great Dominican.

> 'The work which Aquinas did for the Church of his day—the fusion of the highest speculative thought of the time with its profoundest spiritual convictions, the reconciliation of the new truths of the present with the kernel of truth embodied in the traditional creed —is a task which will have to be done again and again as long as the human mind continues progressive and Religion remains a vital force with it.'[9]

[7] *Vide* Rashdall, *Mediaeval Universities*, vol. 1., p. 54, *cf.* the remark on p. 52, 'He was almost as much done to death by S. Bernard as if he had died at the stake.'

[8] Rashdall, *op. cit.*, p. 56; where Abelard is called 'a Christian thinker to the very heart's core,' also 'incomparably the greatest intellect of the Middle Ages, one of the great minds which mark a period in the world's intellectual history.'

[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 367.

At the time of the Renaissance, reinterpretation was again necessary in view of the new accessions of historical, philological and astronomical knowledge. As the finest minds of the period were Christian, it seemed not unreasonable to hope that the theological reformation might be carried through without undue difficulty, and a breach avoided between Catholicism and culture. The new astronomy, however, was met by a full chorus of anathemas, and a wave of dogmatic frenzy swept everything before it. Bruno went to the stake with taunts at the intellectual cowardice of his judges upon his lips, and the new movement lapsed into cynical scepticism or abject superstition. In England and Holland, however, where the '*gendarmes théologiques*' were less vigilant or less powerful, the movement produced Christian Modernists of a remarkable type. Men like Erasmus, More, and Colet united vast learning with good sense, genial wit, and sincere piety. In England the ecclesiastical authorities were in some cases patrons of the new learning; Warham, the Primate, in particular, is eulogized by Erasmus for his moral and material support of learning. The patronage of these English prelates contrasts strongly both with the bigotry displayed by Spanish reactionaries and with the cynical and systematic licentiousness of Italian ecclesiastics who abandoned Christianity in favour of paganism.

These historical examples from the twelfth, thirteenth, and sixteenth centuries indicate that Modernism is no novelty in the history of Christianity. The Christian message has continually been re-interpreted in terms of contemporary culture, which process, save at times of religious or intellectual stagnation, has never ceased. Nor is it likely to cease so long as Christianity remains alive.

It is in fact doubtful if religion could remain alive without the Modernist. Physiologists attribute highly important functions to certain glands in the body which regulate the life-processes, and by their secretions enable the organism to grow and to adapt itself to its environment. Without these particular organs, the phenomena of life and growth as we know them would be impossible. It would be no very extravagant simile to attribute like functions to the Modernist element in any reli-

gious society. A Church without Modernists would be in the condition of a human being without a thyroid gland.

This naturally leads on to another important characteristic of Modernism. It is a movement within and not outside the Church. To live in the Church and share the life of its members —even the least sympathetic of them—and to be so convinced of the indispensable value of that life both for persons and societies, is characteristic of the Modernist's ideal. He attaches such value to the Church and its message that (like St. Paul) he wishes to carry it to the Gentiles also, *i.e.* to translate it into the language of the modern world.

But although the Modernist seeks to interpret Christianity to his age, which involves the translation of the Christian message into terms of contemporary thought, yet his is no merely intellectualist ideal. He does not, it is true, reject theology, but regards it as secondary to religion. Dogma, for him, is not the soul of religion, but the clothing which religion wears. It is the rigid Traditionalist, on the contrary, who is the intellectualist *par excellence*; for he lays the whole emphasis upon a particular and temporary intellectual interpretation of the Christian message, and attaches the very highest importance to *intellectual belief*, which he is apt to confuse with *religious faith*. Dr. Sanday had these facts in mind when he wrote:

> 'So far from setting a premium upon learning, the tendency of the Modernist is all the other way. He regards the creeds as products of excessive intellectualism.'

But the ideal of Modernism may be briefly summed up in the words of one who believed both in freedom and in religion; and was a worthy exponent of the highest traditions of Englishmen at a period which was perhaps our golden age. John Milton writes:

> 'Still closing up truth to truth as we find it; this is the golden rule in theology as well as in arithmetic, and makes up the best harmony in a church; not the forced and outward union of cold and neutral and inwardly divided minds.'[10]

[10] *Areopagitica.*

SAINTS' DAYS, OLD AND NEW

By the Rev. A. F. Robson, M.A., Vicar of Hemel Hempstead.

WE believe that a *new Reformation of Religion* is due, and even overdue. *In the Reformed Church of the Future, will there be any place for Saints' Days?* They bulked very large in Christian observance for many centuries; they meant much to many generations; *will there be any value in them for the Christians of the coming years?*

It will be the attempt of this paper to maintain that there is a place for them, that they have a real value, but that their observance must be of a different character from that which we have inherited. When the Tractarians were endeavouring to make religion a reality to themselves and to their fellow-countrymen, the question they asked of their Church and of the religious system which they had inherited was, 'Can these dry bones live?' And, convinced as they were that there was truth in the doctrine, and vitality in the discipline, of the Church of the Ages, they endeavoured to breathe life into a tradition which seemed smitten with moral sickness. Prominent in this tradition they found the observance of Saints' Days and the cult of the saints. Newman in his famous sermon 'on the use of Saints' Days' asked his fellow-Churchmen why their observance had grown to be neglected: and the reasons that he found were, *first*, our *worldliness*—'taking us as a nation we are bent on gain, and grudge any time which is spent without reference to our worldly business'—and *second*, our *complacency*—'it is a fault of these times to despise the past in comparison with the present. We can scarce open any of the lighter or popular publications of the day without falling on some panegyric of ourselves, or upon some disparaging remarks on the wisdom and virtues of former times.' That was Newman's indictment: and it may very well be that there is truth in it; but certainly *it is not the whole truth*: that is not the complete account of the reasons why the Saints' Days no longer are observed by the mass of English Churchmen. The Tractarians endeavoured to restore their observance. But it is not an exaggeration to say that their efforts were almost entirely ineffectual. Still, the mass of Christian Englishmen do not

observe the Saints' Days. And the fundamental reason of this neglect is really very simple. It is stated concisely in a sentence written by one of our Diocesan Bishops in answer to a request for his approval of a service in celebration of St. George's Day in one of the parishes of his diocese. He wrote: '*It really is very difficult to commemorate persons of whom you know nothing.*' In general, we do not observe the Saints' Days, because such an observance is bound to be unreal. One exception may be made to this: All Saints' Day has a real and a growing hold on many Churchmen.

But—speaking generally—the kalendar might as well be omitted from the Book of Common Prayer for all the attention that is paid to it by most Englishmen. The Anglo-Catholic Churches have their Saints' Day services; and they commemorate both the greater and the lesser saints of the Kalendar at least by the recitation of a Collect. Yet I do not think it is very uncharitable to say that there is an air of unreality, of make-believe, about it all. It is not our worldliness nor yet our complacency that causes most of us to be well-nigh entirely oblivious of the saints of our Prayer Book Kalendar. The fact is that the great majority of the saints whose names are there recorded *are not real figures for any of us.* This is true even of most of the Red Letter Day Saints. St. Paul we know: St. Peter, St. John, St. Thomas, and perhaps St. Mary. *οἶοι πέπνυνται, τοι δὲ σκίαι ἀίσσουσιν.* The thing is not real.

Yet in its origin, the *observance of Saints' Days was a real and natural practice*, and entirely congruous with Christian thought and feeling. We turn to our New Testament, and who does not feel the thrill which the roll-call of the Saints of Israel stirred in the heart of the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews?* He knows that he is compassed about as with a *cloud of witnesses, the martyr witnesses of the faith of Israel;* and remembering them, he goes on to bid his readers to remember also the witnesses of Christian faith: '*Remember your leaders*, the men who spoke the word of God to you: look back *upon the ending of their course and copy their faith.*'

And from the first, Christians remembered them. Duchesne asserts that the observance of the anniversaries of the death of the Martyrs goes back to the second century, *e.g.* the Anniver-

sary of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp was instituted at Smyrna immediately after his death (about 155 A.D.). These anniversaries of martyrs were, naturally, local festivals at first: each Church honoured its own martyrs. But the practice arose of one Church commemorating the martyrs of another: there was constant intercourse between the Churches: and in this way the anniversaries of the great martyrs obtained an almost œcumenical recognition.

The observance of Saints' Days had then a natural and reasonable origin: and it was entirely congruous with Christian sentiment.

And yet it is not too much to say that the cult of the saints, as we find that cult in the Catholic Church, is *in character essentially not Christian, but pagan.*

It is Dom Cabrol who tells us that the ancient pagan world, *en recevant les eaux du baptême, les contamina.* What was the religion of this ancient pagan world? The religion of the civilized world in the early centuries of the Christian era was a fusion of religions: its note was syncretism. There never was *one* pagan religion, writes Dean Inge. A veritable crowd of deities jostled each other in the streets of Rome with a mutual tolerance that would have brought joy to the hearts of some of those who took part in our late Conference at Oxford. The pagan worshipper of the third century delighted to be not indeed merely an honorary member of all the religions—if I may quote Dean Inge's sarcastic phrase—but an active practising worshipper of all the cults: and the philosopher observed this with satisfaction. The Deity, says Themistius, takes pleasure in diversity of homage.

For many centuries the gods had been on their travels from country to country, bringing with them their legends and their cults, everywhere acclimatizing themselves with ready facility. Even as far back as the middle of the fifth century before Christ, Herodotus records the Greek names of seven Egyptian divinities. We know how the Hellenic gods and heroes passed into Italy, took to themselves the names of Italian divinities, but preserved their own traditions. Mars, god of the fields, lent his name to Ares, the god of war. Minerva, who presided over tillage, was promoted to the honours of Athene, goddess

of the arts. Everywhere this process of assimilation and syncretism continued and prevailed. Meanwhile, writes Dean Inge, the common folk maintained their simple sacred holidays through all changes till the victory of Christianity, *and long after*. And long after indeed.

We are accustomed to say that in the Nicene Age the civilization of the ancient world was baptized into Christ. It was baptized into the Church, but it was very far from being baptized with the Spirit. It remained pagan, in thought and in worship.

Dom Cabrol in his book, *Les Origines Liturgiques*, writes quite frankly:

> 'The Catholic Liturgy does not come from Jesus: you must look for its origin in Gnosticism, and even in the last resort to paganism, for which Gnosticism served as a bridge. Paganism had been for a moment conquered by Christianity only to take a striking revenge in the fourth century.'

As the long night of the Dark Ages fell on the world, the cult of the idols flourished anew more vigorously under colour of the cult of the saints and of the martyrs. The process was everywhere the same. Saintyves writes: we see Jupiter or Thor transformed into St. Peter: Apollo becomes St. Michael: Woden or Mars becomes St. Martin: the Keltic Mothers become the Three Maries: Isis is assimilated to the Mother of Christ: and more strangely still, the founder of Buddhism is placed on Christian altars under the title of St. Josaphat. The Christian saints were in many cases just the deities of the ancient world christened and re-named. The worship and the thought of the mass of the people were still pagan.

It would form an interesting study in comparative religion to draw a parallel between the development of hero-worship in Hellenic religion and that of saint-worship in the Catholic Church. In Homer the title 'hero' is given to warriors generally: as the Homeric age gained dignity by the efflux of time, the heroes became exalted above the race of common men: Pindar makes them a race between gods and men: then the term is used of those who are born of intercourse between the immortal gods and mortal women: then they are regarded as local tutelary deities, founders of cities: and in historic times those who had served the state were posthumously honoured as

heroes, *e.g.* Brasidas after Amphipolis. The Greek hero was the Latin *divus*. There are many interesting parallels between these heroes and the Catholic saints. There are stories of apparitions: Maximus of Tyre asserts that he himself has more than once perceived the great Twin Brethren guiding across the waves his storm-tossed ship. He claims to have seen Asklepios and Herakles. So, too, St. Luke appears to St. Catherine of Alexandria and shows her the Virgin's portrait. St. Ursula and her companions appear to St. Angela Mérici and bid her found the religious order of the Ursulines.

The heroes were intercessors. We read that in a time of drought, when animals and men were dying, the magistrates of Aegina determined to invoke Aeacus, the son of Zeus, who obtained from his father the cessation of the scourge. Is the thought very different from that of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which teaches us to ask of the saints, because they have credit with God, that they may obtain for us the things of which we have need?

The heroes were tutelary divinities. So still to-day at Naples each quarter of the city has its own Madonna. The *Lazzarone* kneels before the Madonna of his own street and insults that of the next.

> 'It is not rare to see two *facchinis* quarrelling, drawing their knives on each other each in honour of his own Madonna.'

So, too, a parallel might be drawn between the ancient festivals of the dead and the Catholic commemoration of the martyrs. Yet the commemoration of the martyrs was in its origin a natural and a Christian observance. In the first three Christian centuries the veneration of the martyr saints was a grateful remembrance of their lives and the celebration of the day of their death as the birthday of a heavenly life. The Epistle of the Church of Smyrna concerning Polycarp's martyrdom explains:

> 'Christ we worship as the Son of God: the martyrs we love and honour as disciples and imitators of the Lord.'

But with the Nicene Age there comes formal invocation of the saints as patrons and intercessors and mediators with God. Chapels and churches were built over their graves, and in them, as in the shrines of the heroes, votive offerings were hung. Their relics were preserved, as were the relics of heroes, and

the veneration of the saints was extended to these relics. Closely linked with this cult of relics was the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, as that doctrine was understood in the Dark Ages. To this day both the doctrine and the cult persist. And to this day the relics effect miraculous cures. This statement is not obscure to those who have read M. Baudouin or heard M. Coué. Mr. Frank Buckland discovered that the relics of St. Rosalie at Palermo are in reality the bones of goats. But I imagine that to this day they effect cures. As the Dark Ages pass into the Middle Ages, the cult of the saints, their relics, and their shrines, increases. *L'appétit vient en mangeant.* Dr. Gwatkin scarcely exaggerates when he tells us that the popular religion of the Middle Ages hardly got beyond the worship of saints and the fear of purgatory. It is for the most part extraordinary feats of asceticism and the power of working miracles that are the qualifications for admission into the number of the saints. No tribunal of canonization existed at first: it was the popular voice that made the Catholic saints. Papal canonization came with Alexander III in the year 1170.

The cult of St. George, which some of our fellow-Churchmen are trying now to galvanize into life, is a typical example of mediæval saint-making. St. George is an Eastern saint. The earliest seat of his cult seems to have been at Lydda, near to Joppa. Krumbacher, the greatest Byzantine scholar of modern times, in his critical studies of the Legend of St. George, has made it clear that the earliest form of the story is of an extraordinarily fantastic character, the story of a martyr who suffers under a mythical persecutor, Dadianos, King of the Persians. But about the year 500 A.D. the story was re-cast. Dadianos became Diocletian, and the legend was assimilated to other stories of the persecution of Diocletian. Additions were made as the centuries went by: about the twelfth century the Dragon makes his appearance. The legend of the Dragon obviously recalls the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, which also was localized at Joppa. It would seem that there must be some connexion between the stories, even though the gap is a long one. George, then, is an Eastern saint, and there in the East our crusaders found him: and William of Malmesbury tells how he and his companion, St. Demetrius, appeared

to fight for the Christians at the battle of Antioch. The English crusaders brought him back as the soldiers' saint. The zenith of his popularity in England was during the French wars of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when our armies took St. George as their patron, believing that as once he had appeared to fight on their side, so he might appear again. It is not true to say that he was for them the ideal of chivalry, the champion of the oppressed and helpless. He was nothing of the kind. The people of the Middle Ages were as cruel as they were materialistic. They kept and reverenced in St. George's Chapel at Windsor the heart of the saint, and Canterbury treasured his right arm. Our mediæval ancestors were childlike in their credulity. Like children they loved a marvellous tale, and like children they regarded any moral drawn from it as a rather wearisome adjunct of an otherwise interesting story. They were childlike and they were cruel. If the legend of St. George provided them with an ideal of chivalry, it was an ideal which had singularly little effect on them. The fifteenth century, which saw the zenith of the cult of St. George, saw at the same time the almost incredible barbarities of the Wars of the Roses.

Is it any wonder that there came a great revulsion of feeling when the New Testament fell into the hands of the common people, and men sought truth, not shame? Here in England, what happened? In 1548 the King's Council ordered the destruction of all images in the churches save of persons that were never counted saints. Hence at Worcester the shrines of St. Oswald and St. Wulfstan have vanished, while the tomb of King John remains. A year later the first English Book of Common Prayer abolished all Black Letter Saints' Days. In 1552 four Black Letter Days were restored: Elizabeth added others in 1561: others again were restored in 1662.

But these days were recorded for purposes of secular usages, as dates for fairs, for the Law Courts, not for religious observance. They are not included in the Table of *All* the Feasts that are to be observed. The consequence is that our calendar as it stands to-day is useless and meaningless. Not all the piety of the Tractarians could avail to give it reality. It is like a ghost of the dead: it is a relic of mediaevalism.

Not even an archangel could persuade Englishmen of the twentieth century to venerate St. Enurchus.

Abroad the old saint-worship still continues. Some Modernists—I use the word in its stricter sense—have attempted to defend it. Loisy, in his *L'Evangile et L'Eglise*, maintains that it is an extension of the worship of Jesus—true for faith if not in fact.

> 'Is it not true that the Catholic goes to God through Jesus and to Jesus through the saints? Is it not true that by all those means which the Protestant finds so vulgar and so ridiculous . . . the Catholic places himself in the communion of the saints, which is the communion of Jesus, which is the communion of God?'

To all this special pleading we find our answer in the famous words of Archbishop Whately: 'It makes all the difference whether we put truth in the first place, or in the second.' It was a sense of the untruthfulness of popular saint-worship which caused the revulsion against the mediaeval cults at the Reformation. But still our calendar remains mediaeval: it is an unreal futility.

We have arrived at a critical moment in the history of our Church. Proposals for a revised Prayer Book are before the National Church. We have a real opportunity. We can make a new calendar, and we need one, for there is a real place in Church life for a real observance of real Saints' Days.

I once asked Baron F. von Hügel to advise me on my preaching to the congregation of a village church. Tell them, he said, the stories of great Christian lives. It is these that will bring home the meaning of the Christian religion to simple minds. I am sure he is right. Our expositions of Christian doctrine and philosophy send our congregations to sleep. They listen almost avidly to the stories of Christian lives, and they apply their teaching.

I notice that Miss Underhill, in her book on the *Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day*, makes the same plea for teaching through Saints' Days.

> 'We have behind us a great spiritual history, which shows the highest faculties of the soul in action, the power and the happiness they bring. Do we take enough notice of it? What about our English saints? I mean the real saints, not the official ones: not St. George and St. Alban, about whom we know practically nothing, but Lancelot Andrewes, John Wesley, Elizabeth Fry, about whom we know a great deal.'

The new calendar in the proposed Revised Prayer Book is a great improvement on the present calendar, though it includes some legendary and fictitious figures. It supplies twenty-nine new saints to our list and discards thirteen old names. St. Enurchus is discharged from his duty of protecting the birthday of Elizabeth. Up to a point, it provides us with a compendious record of Church history. But there is no saint of later date than Thomas Aquinas. It is a list of primitive saints, of saints of the Dark Ages, and of the Middle Ages. It is not Catholic in the true sense of that word. It loses a great opportunity. It ought to be wide, comprehensive, Catholic, a roll-call of the great heroes of the Christian life. Such a calendar would give life to our commemorations in church. And yet more important still, it would give life to our Church teaching in the schools. We cannot exaggerate its feebleness and futility in most schools. But children love anniversaries and the keeping of days. In the schools, indeed I am confident, we can teach religion best by biography.

I would conclude this long and discursive paper with a quotation from Dr. Butler, the late Master of Trinity, scholar and saint, *carum ac venerabile nomen.*

> 'The spirits of just men made perfect, of men and women who have fought the good fight and have kept the faith—who out of weakness have been made strong, who have dared all, staked all, and it may be, suffered all for the Name which is above every name—here surely is material for the preacher. Let him turn to such lives as Polycarp, or Origen, or Athanasius, or Benedict, or our own Alfred, or Bernard of Clairvaux, or Francis of Assissi, or Catherine of Siena, or John Wycliffe, or Savonarola, or Martin Luther, or Francis Xavier, or Sir Thomas More, or Fénelon, or George Herbert, or William Law, or John Wesley, or Wilberforce, or Thomas Arnold, or Chalmers, or Duff, or Frederick Denison Maurice, or Charles Kingsley, or Agnes Jones, or Sister Dora, or Henry Lawrence. His people will be the better for it. In the noble phrase of Robert Hall, he will have "enlarged their intercourse with heaven." It has been said that History is an excellent cordial for drooping spirits. It is true, most true, of History: it is even more true of Biography. The life of a true Christian is a monument. High over the ordinary levels of humanity it lifts its head to Heaven, like a column over the desert sands. Its record is of victory. It speaks of those who have become 'more than conquerors' through Him who loved them, of those who have taken Christ at His word—that word not of human hope but of Divine assurance:
>
> "Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world."
>
> 'Yes, Christ has many cordials for the drooping spirits of His servants. Among the most potent—and perhaps the least exhausted—are the Lives of His Saints.'

BOOK REVIEWS

A STANDARD NEW TESTAMENT HANDBOOK*.

Professor G. W. Wade's *New Testament History* is a volume of nearly seven hundred pages closely packed with information concerning the geographical, political, social and religious conditions out of which the literature of the New Testament arose. It is marked by that careful accuracy and trained historical sense which have long made his *Old Testament History* one of the most useful handbooks for students.

Part I deals with the topography of Palestine; the political and religious development of the Jews from the Exile to the fall of Jerusalem; the Roman Empire and its contributions to the diffusion of Christianity; the worship, teaching, discipline, and sects of the Jews; and concludes with an enlightening section on the prevailing ideas and methods of Jewish historians.

Part II deals with textual and documentary criticism. This covers all the books of the New Testament and gives particular attention to the Synoptic problem.

Part III deals with the Chronology of the New Testament. It has two very valuable sections treating the ministry of Jesus according to the earliest sources, and also that ministry as presented in the fourth gospel. It deals next with the Church in the Apostolic Age. In a section of nearly 100 pp. it treats the theological development in the N.T.

It has ten excellent maps and an index. This is not a popular book. It is undoubtedly intended for students. Certainly those who will patiently work through it, will have gathered for themselves a great store of knowledge, such as is demanded for any sound judgement on a variety of questions connected with the rise and expansion of the Christian religion. The most valuable feature of the book is its careful presentation of facts. There is an entire absence of apologetic motive. A good example of Dr. Wade's style may be seen in his treatment of Christ's teaching about divorce. He writes:—

'A declaration respecting divorce was obtained from Jesus through an effort made by the Sadducees to induce him to give a decision on a question which was debated between the supporters of the two Rabbis, Hillel and Shammai. The Law enacted that adultery on the part of a woman should be punished by her execution, her paramour being put to death with her (*Dt.* xxii, 22, cf. *Lev.* xx, 10, *John* viii, 5); and in such a case the wronged husband was free to marry again. The Law also allowed a man to put away his wife "because he had found some unseemly thing in her," the divorced woman and *a fortiori* the husband, being permitted to marry a second time (*Dt.* xxiv, 1-7). There was thus no room for dispute that divorce was permitted by the Mosaic Law, but the Law did not explain what was meant by "some unseemly thing," which was interpreted by the disciples of Shammai to signify unchastity only, but by those of Hillel to cover trivial offences. Jesus, in giving his decision, restricted divorce further than even the school of Shammai, and asserted that the right of divorce was only a concession to men's hardness of heart; according to the purpose of God, as implied in *Gen.* ii, 27, marriage was indissoluble (*Mk.* x, 11, *Lk.* xvi, 18).

* *New Testament History*, by Prof. G. W. Wade, D.D. Methuen. Price 18s. net.

'The principle affirmed by Jesus was reasserted by St. Paul as regards marriages where both parties were Christians, for he directed (and expressly affirmed that his direction was the Lord's) that a wife was not to depart from her husband (if she did she was to remain unmarried or else be reconciled to him) and that a husband should not leave his wife (I *Cor.* vii, 10, *cf. Rom.* vii, 2-3). But where one of the partners was an unbeliever and left the other, the Apostle seems to have modified the comprehensive principle laid down by the Lord, and declared (I *Cor.* vii, 15) that the believing partner was not under bondage in such cases (*i.e.* apparently was not bound to consider the union permanent but was free to marry again). But even in respect of marriage subsisting between professing Christians it might be contended in view of our Lord's habit of making comprehensive statements requiring qualifications suggested by reflection and experience, that His assertion of the indissolubility of marriage presented an ideal which, in view of the actual conditions of life, could not be uniformly maintained (*cf.* the idealistic, but generally impracticable principles enunciated in *Mt.* v, 33-42, vii, 1); and that where departures from it were expedient, the circumstances in which they were admissible must be left (at least for Christians) to the Christian society to determine. This seems to be the explanation of the addition with which the First Evangelist (*Mt.* v, 32, xix, 9) qualifies the prohibition of divorce and re-marriage in *Mk.* x, 11' (pp. 609-10).

Besides the quality of scholarly accuracy, Dr. Wade's book possesses the no less attractive quality of lucid generalisation. In the following sentences he notes two main features of the Johannine theology.

'The first is the introduction of the idea of *Continuity* in connection with (*a*) the Divine Judgment; (*b*) the Resurrection unto life, which are regarded as processes rather than events. The second is the prominence given to the idea of *Unity* pervading Revelation, which, proceeding from the Divine Reason, is imparted through (*a*) the common conscience of mankind, (*b*) the historic life of Jesus, (*c*) the Spiritual presence of Jesus with the Church. Indeed, since the universe is also declared to have been created through the Divine Reason, a unity of origin is attributed alike to the order discernible in the material world and the order induced in the moral sphere by spiritual enlightenment. These features combine to give to the Fourth Gospel a more modern aspect than is manifested by any other work in the New Testament' (p. 680).

We have no doubt that this book will be recommended authoritatively to theological students in our universities, and there is no New Testament handbook which will better deserve to be. It is a monument of compact arrangement and cautious veracity. It does not solve all problems but it conscientiously helps its reader to have a better understanding of them.

A NEW LIFE OF CHRIST.*

St. Luke tells us in the prologue of the Third Gospel that many had taken in hand to write about Jesus Christ. Of those accounts only the Gospel of St. Mark, which records the mission preaching of St. Peter, has survived. Since St. Luke's day many more attempts have been made, but few of them have appealed for any great length of time to the Christian consciousness with the exception of the First and Fourth Gospels. A brilliant account and criticism of post-Reformation lives of Christ is given by Schweitzer in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus.* The English lives of

* *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ,* by A. C. Headlam, D.D. Murray. Price 12s. net.

Christ which we should immediately recommend to any English layman who desired something more than the four Canonical Gospels, are Sir John Seeley's *Ecce Homo,* Canon Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ,* Dr. Glover's *Jesus of History.* We should now add a fourth, Bishop Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ.*

This volume, which undertakes in a popular and yet scholarly fashion to demonstrate that we have in our N.T. a trustworthy presentation of the life and teaching of Jesus, is marked by the learning and sound judgment which characterise the Bishop of Gloucester. No doubt the student of modern N.T. criticism will find Dr. Headlam very conservative in some of his conclusions, but this will not offend him because he will find him to be so in an enlightened manner. The reader who knows nothing of N.T. criticism will learn that between the position which affirms that every statement in the Gospels is verbally accurate, and the other position which affirms that the story of Jesus is pure myth, there is a middle way which teaches that the N.T. accounts of Jesus, although fragmentary and in certain cases inaccurate, are yet, on the whole, trustworthy narratives of fact and are not the fabrications of fiction.

Some years ago Dr. Headlam's book *The Miracles of the New Testament,* demonstrated that its author was a strong believer in the historicity of the miraculous. The present volume does the same, but in a thoroughly reasonable and conciliatory way, as the following paragraphs dealing with the Feeding of the Five Thousand indicate.

'A miracle and a wonderful event may have taken place in many ways, and we need not disbelieve it because our imagination cannot picture to ourselves the way in which it could have happened. I would venture to suggest therefore that, exercising a certain amount of suspense of judgment, we should refuse to rule out the story on *a priori* grounds, as necessarily unnatural or impossible, and should recognize that something occurred so wonderful as to stir up the people in a remarkable way. I would suggest, also, that we should not be too anxious to adopt a rationalistic explanation of the walking on the waves and the stilling of the storm, and should there also exercise a certain suspense of judgment. It is quite easy to devise rationalistic explanations, but they are never really convincing.

'In St. John's Gospel the story of the feeding of the multitude is followed by a long discourse on the bread of life, which, it is stated, was delivered in the synagogue at Capernaum. It may be doubted whether such a discourse was ever spoken. There is no record of such an event in the other Gospels, and we have seen how the period of preaching in the synagogue had probably come to an end. It is not, indeed, impossible that such an event should have happened, but it is improbable. If we turn to the discourse, it will appear as an admirable example of the way in which the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, although not (certainly in many cases) the record of discourses actually delivered, interpret, and interpret correctly, the teaching of Jesus and the meaning of His life' (p. 278).

The *mitis sapientia* of this method will carry weight to-day. Reflecting minds do not wish to have conclusions forced upon them with authority. They desire reasons and suggestions which they may weigh and consider. As for miracles, whether we believe them or not, depends largely upon our education and type of mind, not upon our loyalty to Christ, and the same too of the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. What we need is to recover the moral and spiritual values of the Gospel, and Dr. Headlam's book will help to that end.

The reader who knows nothing of modern N.T. criticism and little of the historical background of the Gospels will find that this volume will introduce him to a way of reading his Gospels which is both modern and reassuring. We ought to add that this volume is obviously only part of a much larger work and in consequence many important matters in the Gospels are not treated.

WHOLESOME WORDS.*

A notable change of attitude has displayed itself of recent years in the Free Churches. The 'dissidence of Dissent' has evaporated; the somewhat narrow and self-conscious sectarianism of a former generation has disappeared. Instead, we observe an increasing tolerance, a wider outlook, an altogether more receptive state of mind. Yet there is at the same time, a sturdy and vigorous adherence to principle, and few signs are visible of any lapse into scepticism or superstition. Dr. Horton's own attitude is clearly stated:

'Millions of Protestants desire a Church, a Catholic Church. But the Roman Church, as seen in history, gives no promise of what they want. They desire a Society of Jesus, but it must be far other than that established by Loyola. The spiritual tyranny and intellectual degradation revealed by Count Hoensbroech (in his remarkable book *Fourteen Years a Jesuit*) cannot be the intention of Jesus. The Papal Church, supported by, and largely governed by, the Jesuit Order, offers no solution to the problem of our time, no refuge for the mind which needs religion, needs Christ, but also needs Truth.'

Dr. Horton holds that the problem of authority, which drives many timid, yet earnest, souls to Rome, is solved whenever the Christ of the Gospels is taken as a guide.

'Our difficulty comes from the immense elaboration, and the numberless divergencies, of a great, implicitly accepted influence, which we know as Christianity. Can we not simplify? Can we not get to the fountain head? Is there not a rule of life which we may identify behind all the elaborate and dogmatic systems which seem to compete for our allegiance?

'The rule of life which we are seeking may be expressed in two words —Be Christlike.'

Dr. Horton would seem to bring us back to that manual of Catholic devotion, the *Imitatio*. His second chapter is indeed devoted to an appreciation of that classic. Yet he sees, as Dean Milman saw, that for all its beauty and spirituality, it is not a genuine and complete *Imitatio;* 'The imitation is only partial. The Christlikeness it would produce is not a likeness of Jesus as He appears to us in the Gospels, still less is it a likeness to Christ as we conceive Him before and after the days of His flesh.'

It is indeed worth while to quote Milman's trenchant words:

'The *Imitation of Christ,* the last effort of Latin Christianity, is still monastic Christianity. It is absolutely and entirely selfish in its aim, as in its acts. Its sole, single, exclusive object is the purification, the elevation of the individual soul, of the man absolutely isolated from his kind, of the man dwelling alone in the solitude, in the hermitage of his own thoughts; with no fears or hopes, no sympathies of our common nature: he has absolutely withdrawn and secluded himself not only from the cares,

* *The Mystical Quest of Christ,* by R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D. Allen & Unwin. Price 10s. 6d. net.

the sins, the trials, but from the duties, the connexions, the moral and religious fate of the world. Never was misnomer so glaring, if justly considered, as the title of the book, the *Imitation of Christ*. That which distinguishes Christ, that which distinguishes Christ's apostles, that which distinguishes Christ's religion—the love of man—is entirely and absolutely left out . . . The *Imitation of Christ* begins in self—terminates in self. The simple exemplary sentence, "He went about doing good," is wanting in the monastic gospel of this pious zealot. Of feeding the hungry, of clothing the naked, of visiting the prisoner, even of preaching, there is profound, total silence. The world is dead to the votary of the *Imitation*, and he is dead to the world, dead in a sense absolutely repudiated by the first vital principles of the Christian faith. Christianity, to be herself again, must not merely shake off indignantly the barbarism, the vices, but even the virtues of the Mediaeval, of Monastic, of Latin, Christianity.'†

The latter part of this famous passage seems almost to have served Dr. Horton with inspiration and a text; for the rest of his book is an elaboration of the thesis that Christ must be followed, not in a cloistered cell, but in the busy places of the world. The Son of Man must be sought and followed among the sons of men.

We heartily welcome this book for its healthy, rational and ethical tone. It breathes the noble Puritan zeal for personal and social righteousness, without its cant, philistinism and narrow-minded pietism. The Free Churches have recently lost two notable leaders, Robertson Nicoll and Dr. James Hastings, whom we respected and now regret; but no living movement depends on individuals. Where there is vigorous life there is always an apostolic succession of torch-bearers.

J.C.H.

RELIGION AT SEVENTEEN.*

In the mind of the parish priest no problem bulks larger than the problem of the adolescent. The number of boys and girls, who, having passed through our Sunday Schools, thereupon cut loose from every form of organized religion is uncomfortably large. Miss Winifred Graham, a member of the Churchmen's Union, has addressed herself to the solution of the adolescent problem. The notes, as she modestly terms them, now reproduced in book form, are the substance of twenty-four addresses given to a class of boys aged from fourteen to seventeen, and it is pleasant to be able to say that never before have we come across a book of this kind, which, whether in point of view, in material, or in that elusive thing called 'spirit,' so exactly meets the needs which it is written to supply.

The themes dealt with range from 'God in the Old Testament' to Prayer, Intercession and Worship, and include such subjects as 'The Beauty of God,' 'Thinking' and 'Mysticism,' subjects surely sufficiently unusual for treatment in a boys' Bible Class, and yet justified by the method of their presentation. Miss Graham claims that the keynotes of all the lessons are Love, Fellowship, Service, and one might add that if, as Herbert Gray has said, 'Christianity is a way of living ordinary life,' these addresses attain their unity in an attempt to portray life as an opportunity for the adventurous exercise of these three great qualities.

Why is it that Miss Graham has succeeded where many have failed lamentably and conspicuously in a like task? Perhaps primarily because

† *History of Latin Christianity*, Vol. ix, pp. 164*f*.

* *The Highway of God*, by Winifred M. Graham. Church of England Sunday School Institute. Pp. 114. Price 2s. net.

of the bond of sympathy and real comradeship so obviously existing between teacher and taught. There is nothing artificial or forced about their relationship; no tendency on the part of the teacher to 'talk down' to her hearers, no ostentatious adaptation of thought or vocabulary, no element of patronage. We see rather Miss Graham's appreciation of and respect for the qualities of her pupils. She believes in them, shares with them her own thoughts, lets them see her mind, and puts before them an ideal of high-hearted, uncalculating service of the highest as a life-long adventure. Miss Graham knows how to tell a story (and there are many both from the Bible and from other sources) so that the characters live, and the moral is clear without being forced. A lover of the best modern poetry, she pays the boys the compliment of believing that they too will appreciate the best when it is presented to them. A student of biblical problems, she offers the modern point of view to her audience in such a way that nothing afterwards will have to be unlearned. A convinced believer in the interest, worth and beauty of common life, she boldly challenges others to become fellow-seekers with her in the quest for truth. It may be hoped that this book will encourage other members of the Churchmen's Union to work along the lines which Miss Graham here follows, and to add to the all too meagre store of literature suited to the religious needs of the adolescent.

W.M.P.

FRIEND OR FOE?*

Many to-day are disturbed about the ultimate bearing of the New Psychology upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. They are aware that some psychologists write as though the Christian religion had been completely swept away by the incoming tide of the new knowledge, and they seek some word of assurance as to the true state of affairs. Mr. Barry's volume is a valuable attempt to meet this need. At home himself in both camps, he seeks to persuade the combatants that in reality they are allies and not opponents, that Christian and Psychologist are by no means incompatible terms, and that an understanding of the tentative positions held by the New Psychology is of the first importance for the work of the Christian Minister at the present day.

Mr. Barry is refreshingly outspoken in his utterances. Theology, he tells us, cannot always play Canute; the Church cannot refuse to face the issue, for refusal to re-state always brings its nemesis. And emphatically there is no cause for panic, since, so far from being antagonistic to the Christian faith, 'Psychology is in many of its aspects more akin to a republication from the scientific standpoint of facts that were known and lessons that were taught, and cures that were achieved "by the finger of God" twenty centuries ago in Galilee.' Here certainly is a valuable clue. Throughout the book our Lord is presented as the great Psychologist, whose teaching and methods support to a quite remarkable extent some of the more revolutionary positions of the new science.

In the first three chapters of his book our author sketches in outline the general standpoint of modern Psychology, stressing the importance of the great primary instincts, and explaining the significance of the unconscious mind, and the paramount importance of suggestion in the direction of life. Instincts must not be crushed or ignored, for they are the source of the driving power of every life. Rather must they be directed, 'sublimated,' converted into channels of social usefulness and creative achieve-

**Christianity and Psychology*, by F. R. Barry, M.A., D.S.O. S.C.M., 1923. 1p. 152 Price 5s. net.

ment. The Unconscious Mind must not be deprecated as the seat of the unpleasant and the unclean, but rather studied with a view to the unification of the whole life and its direction towards the attainment of a single goal. Nor, again, must suggestion be rashly identified with delusion; for suggestion is nothing else than the translation of an idea into an action, without the aid of conscious volition.

All this, as Mr. Barry rightly claims, has an intimate bearing upon the practical business of living the Christian life, and to study the teaching of Christ from the point of view of Psychology is to receive a new impression of the extent to which in its main emphasis that teaching illustrates and guarantees modern discoveries as to the working of the human mind. The teaching of Jesus, for example, about the imperative need for a right choice and a single aim, His emphasis upon the will of God and the losing of the self in devotion to the cause of the Kingdom, the paramount value which He put upon the individual, His treatment of sin, His recognition of 'the expulsive power of a new affection,' the stress He laid on positive achievement and adventurous service—all this has an essentially modern ring, and vindicates anew the Christian claim that in Jesus of Nazareth we see the leader not of one age, but of all, a teacher more modern than the moderns, a pioneer who out-dares the most adventurous of our present reformers.

Mr. Barry thrusts shrewdly enough at the absurd contention of some psychologists that to explain and to explain away are one and the same. He points out that because we begin to know how things are done, 'we cannot simply assume that God doesn't do them.' If part of the power of prayer may be best explained as the power of suggestion, that is neither to decry prayer nor to eliminate God. If in the fight with sin '*Veni Creator* is a more potent exorcism than *Retro Satanas*,' the discovery of a better weapon does not affect the age-long insistence of the Church upon the life-and-death character of the conflict. If, again, the researches of the psychologist into the nature of human personality are found to throw light upon the relation of the human and the divine in Christ, talk about the denial of our Lord's divinity will be as irrelevant as it is ineffective. Psychology requires, like all new knowledge, not the denial of the old, but its re-statement and re-interpretation in terms of the new. At the same time it is frankly admitted that 'some traditional dogmas will have to be fairly drastically rehandled if the truth they contain is to be made significant.' That is bravely said and puts the position of the Modernist in a single sentence. Mr. Barry enters a much needed protest against the modern tendency to substitute the attainment of pleasing sensations for the rigorous search for truth as the aim of religion. 'Any religion can make people speak with tongues.' In the first century St. Paul and St. John saved the Church from this disastrous equation of religion with emotional excitement, and Mr. Barry would clearly assign to the Modernist of to-day a similar work of rescue. In the present day much of our Theology, and especially prayer-book Theology, is in a hopeless conflict with essential Christianity. Revision and re-statement are therefore vital to the Church's efficiency, and the Modernists are Modernists 'because of their reverence for the Catholic Faith, and their evangelical desire to propagate it.'

Mr. Barry has written a book which is clear, sane and courageous. It should do much to relieve the minds of the perplexed, and to catch its spirit of balanced optimism and forward-looking faith would be to enter anew the regions of joy and transforming power familiar to the revolutionary pioneers of the religion of Jesus.

W.M.P.

CORRESPONDENCE

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

One sentence in Mr. de Braths' very able article on 'Christianity and Psychical Research' deserves special attention. He says: '*This knowledge is of grave importance to the prospects of the Church in Britain.*' This is true in more respects than one; I merely wish to indicate *one* direction in which the importance of this study is not sufficiently realised. Probably comparatively few of the clergy realise the wide spread sense of uncertainty which there is in the minds not only of avowed agnostics, but among regular Churchgoers and even earnest Communicants. Those who like myself have been students of Psychical Research for about thirty years, will have been brought into contact with numerous doubters, and will know by experience the effect which a knowledge of psychic facts has had on troubled or sceptical minds.

I will mention four instances personally known to me. One is that of an intelligent man, an avowed agnostic for many years, who after study and experience in this subject wrote to me that he could now believe that Love is at the foundation of the universe. Another is a trained teacher who said to me that this study had 'given her back her New Testament,' which she had relegated to the category of fairy tales and myths.

A third, a regular communicant, confessed that his mind had not been free from doubt and uncertainty until a thorough investigation of this subject completely settled his faith in God and the future life.

A fourth was an aggressive and very positive rationalist; but certain spontaneous phenomena startled him into inquiry which led to his entirely altering his attitude towards religion.

If in the limited experience of one individual four such cases can at once be cited, how many thousands must there be which could bear witness to the salutary effect of this subject on the religious life of the nation.

The mission of the Church is not only to build up the faithful, and those who have no doubts (often because they do not think about their creed); but to win the unbeliever, and the honest, earnest sceptic, and in this task the Church cannot afford to neglect the study of facts which are amply attested, and which undermine effectively the materialistic philosophy which has been so influential during the last sixty years.

H. A. Dallas.

Crawley.

THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN LEAGUE.

Sir,

A service in connection with the Liberal Christian League will be held on Thursday, 29th May, at 7 p.m., at St. Ethelburga's, Bishopgate, E.C., when the Rev. Dr. Geikie-Cobb will preach on Natural and Revealed Religion. This should be of interest to London readers of the *Modern Churchman.*

E. Capleton,
Hon. Sec. L.C.L.

28 Red Lion Square,
High Holborn, W.C. 1.